20326/B
D. XIX. a

# *DISSERTATIONS ON MAN.*

# DISSERTATIONS

ON

# MAN,

PHILOSOPHICAL, PHYSIOLOGICAL, AND POLITICAL;

IN ANSWER TO

MR. MALTHUS's

"*Essay on the Principle of Population.*"

BY

T. JARROLD, M.D.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR CADELL AND DAVIS, STRAND, AND BURDITT, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1806.

WELLCOME
HISTORICAL
MEDICAL
LIBRARY

# *PREFACE.*

WHEN I formed the idea of writing an Answer to Mr. MALTHUS's Essay, it was my design to have examined the reasoning and the facts in each of the chapters, and candidly to have enquired how far they applied to the subject; but, on further consideration, the present contracted plan appeared more eligible.

As the theory advanced by Mr. Malthus is new, and as it involves many points of the greatest interest to the Theologian, the Politician, and the Philosopher, it might have been expected that men of established reputation would have favored the world with their remarks; but as hitherto nothing of consequence has appeared, I, who have no name with the public, or any expectation of exciting much attention, have taken up the subject, under the hope, that, by keeping it in some measure before the public,

we may at length obtain just and consistent views of it.

That the present Dissertations are without errors, or that they will reclaim those who have acknowledged their conviction of the truth of Mr. Malthus's theory, I am not vain enough to expect; but should it provoke further attention, and writers of sufficient talents engage in the discussion, no doubt remains with me that the friends of freedom and of man will gain an important triumph.

The present Dissertations have been long written, and would sooner have appeared had they not been unavoidably delayed; should they meet with any favor from the public, other Dissertations will be put to the press.

STOCKPORT, *July* 25, 1806.

# CONTENTS.


Page

*Dissertation on Population. Introduction.* -- -- -- 9

*An Enquiry into the Truth of Mr. Malthus's second Proposition* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 24

*Of Drunkenness* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 38

*Of Prostitution* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 48

*Of Celibacy* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 41

*Of unwholesome Occupations* -- -- -- -- -- -- 59

*Of Misery* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 67

*Of the Checks to Population among the American Indians* 75

*Of the Checks to Population among the ancient Inhabitants of the North of Europe* -- -- -- -- -- 104

*Of the Checks to Population in Siberia* -- -- -- -- 124

*Of the Checks to Population in Norway* -- -- -- -- 134

*Of the Checks to Population in Switzerland* -- -- -- 144

*Of the Effects of Epidemic Years on Population* -- -- 156

*Of the Checks to Population in various Countries* -- -- 173


---

*Further Considerations of the Principles of Population.*


*Introduction* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 193

*Of the Duration of the Life of Man* -- -- -- -- -- 199

*Of the Increase of Animals* -- -- -- -- -- -- 228

*Of the Checks to the Increase of the Human Race* -- 245

*The same Subject continued* -- -- -- -- -- -- 254

*Of Fecundity* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 275

*Of Sterility* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 289

*Of Hereditary Diseases* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 300

*General Observations* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 306

*Of the Doctrine of Providence* -- -- -- -- -- -- 314

*Conclusion* -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- 361

# DISSERTATION

# ON POPULATION.

## *INTRODUCTION.*

THE publication on which I am about to make a few remarks, has gained its author some celebrity as a writer on political economy; but thinking, as I do, that the principles advanced are erroneous, and their tendency injurious, I need make no further apology to the public for attempting to counteract their influence.

Mr. Malthus has enforced and illustrated his principles in a large quarto volume, but the principles themselves may be comprised in a few sentences, and nearly in his own words, as follows:

"The principal object of the present essay," says Mr. M. "is to examine the effects of one great cause intimately united with the very nature of man, which, though it has been constantly and powerfully operating since the commencement of society, has been little noticed by the writers who have treated on this subject.*---The cause to which I allude, is the constant tendency in all animated life to increase beyond the nourishment prepared for it.†---That population has this constant tendency to increase beyond the means of subsistence, will sufficiently appear from a review of the different states of society in which man has existed. But before we proceed to this review, the subject will perhaps be seen in a clearer light, if we endeavour to ascertain what would be the natural increase of population, if left to exert itself with perfect freedom; and what might be expected to be the rate of increase in the productions of the earth, under the most favorable circumstances of human industry. A comparison of these two rates will enable us to judge of the force of that tendency in population to increase beyond the means of subsistence which has been stated to exist.‡

* Malthus' Essays, page 1. † Page 2. ‡ Page 3.

"In the northern states of America, where the means of subsistence have been more ample, the manners of the people more pure, and the checks to early marriages fewer, than in any of the modern states of Europe, the population was found to double itself for some successive periods every twenty-five years; yet even during these periods, in some of the towns, the deaths exceeded the births, and they consequently required a continued supply from the country to support their population.*---According to a table of Euler, calculated on a mortality of 1 in 36, if the births be to the deaths in the proportion of 3 to 1, the period of doubling will be only $12\frac{4}{5}$ years; and these proportions are not only possible suppositions, but have actually occurred, for short periods, in more countries than one. Sir Wm. Petty supposes a doubling possible in so short a time as ten years. But to be perfectly sure that we are far within the truth, we will take the slowest of these rates of increase; a rate in which all concurring testimonies agree, and which has been repeatedly ascertained to be from procreation only. It may safely be pronounced, therefore, that population, when unchecked, goes

* Page 4.

on doubling itself every 25 years, or increases in a geometrical ratio;* (suppose a population of one million of people, in one period of 25 years they will increase to two millions, in the second period to four millions, in the third to eight, and so on): but the increase of subsistence cannot be at the same rate; if, by good management, the quantity be doubled in 25 years, in the next period of 25 years it cannot be quadrupled. The rate of doubling in the population is geometrical, but in the subsistence it is only arithmetical.

"The necessary effects of these two rates of increase, when brought together, will be striking. Let us call the population of this island 11 millions, and suppose the present produce equal to the easy support of such a number; in the first 25 years the population will be 22 millions, and the food being also doubled, the means of subsistence would be equal to this increase; in the next 25 years the population would be 44 millions, and the means of subsistence only equal to the support of 33 millions; in the next period the population would be 88 millions, and the means of subsistence just equal to the support of half that number; and, at the conclusion

* Page 5.

of the first century, the population would be 176 millions, and the means of subsistence equal only to the support of 55 millions, leaving a population of 121 millions totally unprovided for. The human species would increase as the numbers 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256; and subsistence, as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. In this supposition no limits whatever are placed to the produce of the earth, yet still the power of population being in every period so much superior, the increase of the human species can only be kept down to the level of the means of subsistence by the constant operation of the strong law of necessity, acting as a check upon the greater power."*

The way in which this acts may be classed under two general heads---the preventive, and the positive: by the preventive, is understood celibacy; by the positive, is comprehended "all unwholesome occupations, severe labour and exposure to the seasons, extreme poverty, bad nursing of children, great towns, excesses of all kinds, the whole train of common diseases and epidemics, wars, pestilence, plague, and famine; to these are added, promiscuous intercourse,

* Page 8.

unnatural passions, violations of the marriage bed, and improper acts to conceal the consequences of irregular connexions."---Such are the checks which keep down the population of the world to the subsistence in it, and which may be resolved into *moral restraint*, *vice*, and *misery*. With three such powerful agents at command, Mr. Malthus lays down the following propositions: "1. Population is necessarily limited by the means of subsistence. (Granted.) 2. Population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increase, unless prevented by some very powerful and obvious checks. 3. These checks, and the checks which repress the superior power of population, and keep its effects on a level with the means of subsistence, are all resolvable into moral restraint, vice, and misery."*

Such is a general but just view of the theory advanced by Mr. Malthus: as we go along, our author's sentiments, and his illustrations of them, will be more developed.

On perusing the foregoing sketch, the attention is roused and strongly interested by the statement, that the principle of increase in population

* Page 16.

is stronger than the possible increase of subsistence. This idea, so calculated to startle and confound---which at once seems to have its origin in nature, but is contradicted by experience---which accounts for the population of the globe by increase from a single pair, but excludes the Deity from the government of it; this idea, I say, which is so important in its consequences, so plausible in its relation, and in every way so interesting, claims a fair, a full, and an impartial investigation.

To the just prosecution of this subject, it is proper some country, whose increase in population and in the means of supporting it, is known, should be mentioned, as a standard by which to compare others. Mr. M. has selected America; and at once assumes it as a fact, that the natural power of increase, in every country, in every age, and in every stage of civilization, is the same as in America; in this assumption, I apprehend, he has committed his leading error: but through his book he urges it as a fact, that the population of every state which does not increase at the rate of doubling its numbers in 25 years, is prevented by the operation of vice, misery, or moral restraint; and, consequently, that in the state in which the increase in population is the slowest,

vice, misery, and moral restraint the most prevail. But on making an impartial estimate of the degree of evil with which various nations have been visited, such an inference does not follow: for instance, the Jews, when captives in Egypt, suffered all the miseries of slavery, their food was scanty and their labour excessive, which, doubtless, shortened the lives of some and prevented the births of others, yet they doubled their numbers, by actual increase, in 15 years. The American colonists, whom Mr. M. selects as a standard for the whole world, were not under more favorable circumstances than the generality of persons in Europe, yet in Europe a doubling is not effected in fewer than 500 years. The colonists were exposed to a climate injurious to their health, and had to contend with numerous tribes of fierce and barbarous natives, who sought their extermination; they also suffered from the injurious privations incident to a thin population and a foreign country: in Europe, evils greater than these are seldom felt; and there have been periods of 15 or 25 years, in particular states, when all the felicity, and all the plenty, America in her best years could boast of, were enjoyed in them, without a similar increase in population following.

If we pass from Europe to Asia, and ask what China knows of vice, misery, and moral restraint more than America? an answer will with difficulty be found. China, for many successive years, has suffered nothing from war, from famine, or from pestilence; but whilst America makes rapid advances in population, China remains without increase. If what is here advanced be correct, the principles Mr. M. supports, have not that influence on population he contends for: but let us examine his positions a little more minutely.

Common diseases and inclement seasons are mentioned in connexion with war, with unwholesome occupations, and a long catalogue of other evils, as if they all depended on the same cause. Common diseases and unwholesome seasons are beyond the controul of man; human foresight can neither prevent their approach, nor ward off their effects; but war is a voluntary act: this, however, is a distinction Mr. M. doss not seem disposed to make. The life of man is of limited duration; when he has waited his appointed time, he is taken from his post, and another occupies it; the means by which this is effected we term natural death, but by Mr. M's. way of reasoning, all deaths are natural, because all the

evils that are in the world are necessary to the proper administration of its laws. War is necessary; for if there were no wars, there must be more misery in some other way, consequently those that die by war, die by a law of nature.---It would add considerably to the perspicuity of Mr. M's. reasoning, if he had made a distinction between the natural tendency to death, implanted in the constitution, and the acceleration of it by war and other calamities; but the natural progress to the grave is, in his estimation, so slow, and the principle of life so vigorous, that common diseases are of little consideration; the gap they make, is not half wide enough to receive the numbers that are constantly pressing towards it.

Mr. Malthus is angry with Mr. Godwin for imputing much of the misery of the world to the civil governors of it; such an idea appears to him ridiculous, and he fully exculpates them by his theory. "A great part of Mr. Godwin's book," says Mr. Malthus, "consists of an abuse of human institutions, as productive of all or most of the evils which affect society. The consideration of a new and totally unconsidered cause of misery, would evidently alter the state of these arguments, and make it

absolutely necessary that they should be either new modelled or entirely rejected."*---Mr. Godwin attaches blame to the institutions of man, but Mr. Malthus fixes it on the laws of nature; the one accuses the civil government, the other the government of the universe. Our author having, as he flatters himself, traced the checks to population, which he enumerates under the heads of vice and misery, and fixed them among the laws of nature, is so anxious for the full exercise of their power, that in his zeal he pleads for murder, in some circumstances, not as a discretionary, but a necessary act;---as follows:

"If a child is born into a world already possessed, if he cannot get subsistence from his parents, on whom he has a just demand, and if the society do not want his labour, he has no claim of right to the smallest portion of food, and in fact has no business to be where he is. At nature's mighty feast there is no vacant cover for him; she tells him to be gone, and will quickly execute her own orders, if he do not work on the compassion of some of her guests; if these guests get up and make room for him, other intruders immediately appear, demanding the same favor. The report of a provision for

* Page 380.

all that come, fills the hall with numerous claimants; the order and harmony of the feast is disturbed, and plenty that before reigned, is changed into scarcity, and the happiness of the guests is destroyed by the spectacle of misery and dependence in every part of the hall, and by the clamorous importunity of those who are justly enraged at not finding the provision which they had been taught to expect. The guests learn too late their error in counteracting those strict orders to all intruders issued by the great mistress of the feast, who, wishing that all her guests should have plenty, and knowing that she could not provide for unlimited numbers, humanely refused to admit fresh comers when her table was already full."*

This sentence might have been applauded in the councils of Nero, or in the camps of Attilla or of Cortez; for the indiscriminate murders committed by the orders of these chiefs could not fail to produce in their minds an idea that the conduct they had sanctioned and commanded would be deemed monstrous by the bulk of mankind; how must they then be gratified at finding that, in place of an execrable, they had acted a

* Page 531.

meritorious part; and that the numbers they had slain, were only the unprotected guests, who craved admittance to a table already full, to take which away from the hall, was to render those who remained an acceptable service.

That such sentiments would be agreeable to such characters cannot be doubted, but that Mr. M. should dare to advance them, excites my surprise; had he been in a sportive humour, and ironically attempted to compare what he conceived to be the government of the world with the management of a diocese, and the feast of nature with a visitation dinner, the conceit might have amused us. A bishop has a right to say to a curate, striving to thrust himself into a benefice, that he may partake of a feast, "Begone! there is no empty cover for you!" The curate might say he was starving, "that is no consideration of mine; your friends, to whom you have a right to look, cannot assist you, and I will not. Porter, do your office, and thrust this friendless suppliant from the door."

Such language, on such an occasion, it is possible to conceive, may have happened. But at nature's mighty feast, none are bishops, but all are men; there is no distinction; all that are invited are at liberty to partake, and the life of

a guest is sacred: to be invited to the same table, implies equality; and to possess life, is to possess the invitation. The table is not spread by any set of men, they only pluck the fruit; the Master himself presides, and all he invites are equally welcome. Nor is it the prerogative of one guest to dismiss another from the hall, the Master calls on whom he will to vacate a seat, and his voice is irresistibly heard. Should an arrogant guest say, at our last feast we had greater plenty, and were better accommodated; the strangers that are introduced have changed the face of our affairs, and converted an abundance into a scarcity:---It may be asked, has all the fruit been gathered? is it not possible to provide another cover, and to lengthen the table? The same ill-tempered individual may reply, that cannot be done without trouble, and these intruding strangers will never render us any service. Suppose they do not, they will never do you an injury: you can allow them to labour and gain their living; they are willing to cultivate the waste lands, and they have a right to them; it is the vacant cover nature has provided, as their share of the feast. And when the time arrives that there is no waste land to break up, it will be proper to enquire whether the

great Master of the feast continues to press guests into the hall; if he does, Mr. M. may then come forward and charge his Maker with folly.

Had Mr. M. written a quarto volume, to prove, from present appearances, that some event would happen at a future period of the world, he might have received his share of compliment among other ingenious theorists; but when he attempts to prove that, on the plan of the world, the end and the means do not even now agree---that a power of increase is given, without the possibility of subsistence being equal to it---other sentiments and other feelings are excited, and an enquiry is naturally made into the authority by which man holds his life.

# *AN ENQUIRY*

INTO THE TRUTH OF

## MR. MALTHUS'S SECOND PROPOSITION:

"*That population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increase, unless prevented by some very powerful and obvious checks.*"

IN the view I take of the subject,---The world is the gift of God to man, for his accommodation and support; it is his own; its productions are at his disposal, and subservient to his pleasure; but to possess and enjoy them, he must labour; it is the tenure by which he holds the gift; life, without labour, is promised neither in revelation or by nature. The grass, indeed, springs spontaneously, and the beasts of the forest satisfy their wants without their care; but thorns and briars are the offerings of nature to man; these he must remove by the labour of

his hands, and sow in their place seeds of more kindly growth, these again he must watch with incessant care, and patiently wait their maturing. The conditions on which an animal holds its life are very different from those on which man holds his: an animal that is wild is under the guidance of instinct, and is seldom pinched with want; if it submit to the authority of man, he undertakes to supply it with food; thus it exercises no thought, and feels no anxiety about its subsistence.

But man is not, nor can be, subject to any earthly being; no one can supply his wants; he receives laws and does homage to his Maker alone, who early appointed, and the appointment cannot be revoked, that the sweat of the brow shall be the means of his subsistence. By resisting this condition, the right to life is forfeited, and the evils Mr. M. speaks of, are made the executioners of the penalty; famine follows idleness, and pestilence accompanies famine. But suppose this law is fulfilled; suppose the required labour is bestowed on the ground, and that an abundant crop is the consequence, is this, in the nature of things, to excite the principle of increase in such a way as to occasion the birth of more children than the most abundant harvests

can feed? If so, the Lawgiver has no authority; he commands, but a power stronger than his, frustrates his purposes; this power, Mr. M. says, is vice or misery. If this doctrine be true, the human race are in a more miserable situation than the most desponding believe them to be. The breaker of a law may justly expect punishment, but to keep a law and be subject to still more severe and wide-spread evil, is to be subject to the cruelest despotism, such as the world cannot be governed by. If Mr. M. has only considered the penal laws which hang over the human race, he knows but little of the nature of the government he is under; any more than he would know of the laws of this country by studying a particular branch of them: to attend to only such parts as suit our inclination, implies prejudice and leads to error.

The bounty of nature is as liberal as her laws are strict; harvest follows seed time with the same certainty as punishment follows idleness. Nature knows the wants of all her guests, and is pledged to supply them, provided her laws are not violated; she never invites to a feast, and then mocks her guests with an empty plate; but when she bids to an entertainment, she bids also to the preparation for it. It

is weakness, or worse, to complain that the hall in which the whole human race partakes is too small for the guests, till every part is full. Myriads of acres have never yet supplied a single cover, or stationed a single family; and until this is done, it is improper to say the bounty of Providence is not fully equal to the wants of man.

In the circuit Mr. M. takes round the world, to enquire which of the checks watches over each country, and bars its population from further increase, he notices the want of bread as the general cause; the want of bread, is the unceasing, unavailing cry, he hears in nearly every country, and its echo sounds so constantly in his ears, that the corn and wine which might, with the proper exercise of that care and labour enjoined on man, be procured, never appears to engage his attention; his mind is wholly directed to the quantity of subsistence actually possessed, and on it he founds his reasoning.

In his estimation, the Indians, thinly scattered over the vast continent of North America, are as completely prevented from increasing in number, by impending scarcity, as the comparatively full peopled empire of China; and the same check which keeps down the population of these coun-

tries operates in every other. In other terms, as the present generation has no surplus of food, an increase in the next is impossible. Such is our author's reasoning.

I grant, the Americans collect no more food than they consume, neither do the Chinese, or any other people on the globe; for where would be its utility? But they could collect more if they pleased, and would if they wanted it. The Americans have not emptied their rivers of fish, their forests of game, or by labour fertilized all their country. The Chinese have not planted the bread-fruit tree; and although their land is well cultivated, it admits of further improvement; in its present state, the soil is rich, the crops more frequent, and more abundant, than in Europe, and the population not above one third greater than that of France, in proportion to the extent of country; and we know that France, with prodigious forests, and a bad system of argriculture, has a full supply of corn for the wants of her own people, and has often a surplus for foreign markets.

In saying that population increases where the means of subsistence increase, Mr. M. has not only overlooked the charter by which the world is held, and the obligations which are imposed on

man as the price of his existence, but he has also overlooked the principle which binds man to man in civil contact, I mean, mutual assistance. Were an artisan to resolve on being a farmer, when his labour was not wanted, he would render himself at least useless; and were the whole community to form the like determination, in what would they benefit each other? But as men must labour, every society has endeavoured to make it lighter by dividing it: one is a farmer, another is a manufacturer; one contributes to the necessary, another to the artificial wants; and thus the service of each individual tends to the public good. If one department is inadequately supplied, young persons are invited to engage in it, and the common study is to provide enough, but not a redundancy, to answer every want a civilized people feel.

But on the plan of reasoning Mr. M. adopts, the common necessaries of life are as little under human direction, as the wind or rain; he knows of no means to increase their quantity, but considers them as natural productions, unassisted by art, or, at least, as incapable of admitting the further application of well-directed industry. But the farmer is not governed by these principles; to increase his crop, he labours: as he

cannot command the seasons, he patiently waits their change. But to stock a market is a trade, entered into with a view to profit, and abandoned when it can no longer be obtained. As the life of a farmer is a life of labour, and as labour is a duty, not a privilege, he expects a compensation for all his services beyond the requirements of his own family, and he finds it in the sale of his crop: he does not grow corn to be stored up, but to be sold, of course no market will ever be regularly supplied with more than there are regular purchasers to take off.

Let a new market be opened, or increase the demand in the old one, and the public attention is immediately excited; emulation is fired, and new and superior modes of husbandry are sought after. It is reversing the order established in the world, to increase the quantity of subsistence, under an idea that at some future period children will be born to consume it. In place of saying, population increases where subsistence increases, it would be more correct to say, subsistence increases because population increases: but this would be to destroy the doctrine Mr. M. labours with so much pains to establish. Suppose in England there was a considerable increase in children, what would be the conse-

quence? must they starve because no corn is laid up in store for them? the experience of the country controverts such an idea: however great their number, they are welcome to our world: at first their wants are small, and are scarcely felt, but these gradually increase, and the farmer soon finds a quicker demand for the produce of his land; it excites no alarm---the low and secret whisper of an approaching famine is not heard---but, on the contrary, all rejoice; and the farmer, fully satisfied with his propects of gain, resolves to purchase manure to increase the fertility of his ground, and to break up unproductive wastes, over which the plowshare had never passed.--- Thus the supply is occasioned by the demand.

There is in every town a call for an increase of trade: "Give us more trade!" is the language of many;---the same call is made by the farmer, "Give me a good market, and give me waste land." In that part of nature's storehouse is laid up subsistence for millions, which requires only the accustomed expenditure of labour to bring into use. "Present me with suitable motives, and I will solicit nature to yield her increase."

So much is agriculture conducted in the spirit of trade, that a farmer commonly turns it over in his mind by what kind of produce he can gain the

largest profit: if he lives near a town, he sends to market no other article than milk; if his residence be at a distance, he calculates accurately whether the growing of corn will pay more than the fatting of cattle, and he acts accordingly. The farmer, in fact, is the servant of the public; he knows the wants that will in the ensuing year be felt, and he endeavours to meet them: but it is not required of him to provide twice the quantity wanted, in order, as Mr. M. argues, to excite the want.

The principle on which he serves, is that on which a merchant traffics; the motive in both is profit: and as there is no increase of subsistence without an increase of labour; and as no man will labour for nothing, or on a chance of being paid at some future time,---so the farmer must have a present reward.

Under the best agricultural management, blighted crops occasionally lessen the average produce; and so nearly do the supply and the demand, in common years, balance each other, that a small deficiency is sensibly felt. But it is not the province of the farmer to calculate on such occurrences; to him the quantity is of no moment, for if the crop be scanty the price is advanced; the farmer has done all that can be

required of him when he has brought his crop to market; it is the duty of the government, not the business of the farmer, to provide against years of scarcity. An evil foreseen ought to be guarded against: it is folly to complain of scarcity, if no means have been taken to prevent it. In Egypt, and through the east, granaries were in early use, and to this day they are in many places continued; in commercial countries they are not of such importance, because corn is an article of merchandize, and may be purchased when it cannot be grown: but it is an indispensible obligation in all governments to watch over this circumstance.

To anticipate evil is natural to man; the plan of life is founded on this principle, and so is the plan of government. Do we not lay up in prosperity, to meet adversity? Is it not part of that labour, that service we pay for our lives? Foresight and providence are necessary to the supply of human wants; to waste on the present moment, and on our own persons, the supply of future years, is irrational; for the cares of a generation extend from the beginning to the close of it. The decrepitude of age is as much entitled to kindness and protection, as the imbecility of childhood; both these states have a

claim on the labour of others. But it does not concern one generation to abridge the toil of the succeeding, or to live in celibacy lest they should be too numerous. The measure of our labour is not the measure of theirs: as are the wants, so must be the exertion to remove them.

If Mr. M. had said, that population is equal to the cotton or woollen cloth, and endeavouring to get beyond it, and if more children were born they must go naked, the conceit would be laughed at: but really there is no difference in principle, between saying the population presses hard upon the cotton or woollen cloth, or upon the subsistence; all are articles in common use, and of limited production; and as the country has sufficient confidence in her manufacturers to be under no anxiety about the supply of cloth, why not rely on her farmers in like manner? The world is in as great danger of a scarcity of clothing as of corn, but hitherto the increase in sheep has kept pace with the increase of people, and dispels all fears upon that subject, at least from the present generation. In the existing state of the world, if more cotton or more corn were wanted, more would be grown; all the soil is not cultivated, and it is indifferent to the great

bulk of the people how they are occupied; they plant cotton, or sow corn, or throw the shuttle, just as they are directed.

Suppose it was known at Manchester, that twice as many yards of muslin would be wanted to purchase in a few years as at present are brought to market, would it be consistent with the well-earned character for assiduity and enterprise of the merchants of that town, phlegmatically to say, the demand cannot be supplied; no more goods are in the market than are regularly purchased by old customers, and we shall not abridge their orders to accommodate strangers? Or would they not rather be induced to greater exertion, under a prospect of an increase of gain? One merchant would inform the growers, who in consequence would engage more servants and more land; another lays plans for an acceleration of carriage; another invites strangers to the manufactories by an increase of wages: thus the demand is met by the supply. It is exactly in the same way, and on the same principles, a market is stocked with provisions. Was the demand instantaneous and peremptory, it could not be supplied; but the increase is gradual, and it is anticipated.

Suppose a colony sent to a distant country,

in which the natives were hostile to them, how must they live? The answer is not difficult: they have a claim on the mother country for the corn they contributed to raise, and which they would have consumed had they not emigrated; and, by the next harvest, their own labour will furnish them an abundant supply. In this case, an increase of population was not invited by an increase of subsistence,---but an increase in population has occasioned an increase of subsistence. The very reverse of Mr. M's. second proposition.

Again, if a town is built on a waste, as has been done in Scotland, the offers of easy rents and advantageous terms, fill it with people, who convert the waste to a garden: they accept the offer under no idea of finding plenty gathered to their hands; they calculate on nothing but a reward for their labour.---Or if barracks are built on an uncultivated heath, barrenness gives way to fertility; and land, that before was of little value, now yields an abundant crop. Such are the uniform consequences of an increase of people, in countries protected by laws.

But there must arrive a period, when, if population continues to double itself in any given number of years, all the land will be cul-

tivated, all the produce consumed, and a further addition to population impossible. To this period Mr. M. looks with so much confidence, that he represents his arguments formed on it, as impregnable. It is to this point,---this bulwark of Mr. M's. theory,---that I shall principally direct my attention. But before disclosing my sentiments, it may be proper briefly to notice the leading subjects treated of by him.

## OF DRUNKENNESS.

THAT vice of any description, is a check to population, cannot be denied; but its extent, taken in the aggregate, is less than is generally apprehended: of this, Mr. M. appears conscious; for, though he places vice foremost among the scourges of mankind, he makes but little use of it when he speaks practically of the evils by which the world is desolated.

Of all vices, drunkenness and debauchery are most common, and most destructive. They are the vices of social dispositions; the concealed rocks on which a bad education precipitates a generous temper. But the disposition which leads to vice, prompts to marriage. The drunkard marries from a love of society; the debauchee, because he is disgusted at himself and his associates: it seldom happens that a drunkard is a bachelor, or a debauchee unmar-

ried, at the age of forty. Drunkenness, though much too often practised by young men, is seldom carried to that excess which breaks up the constitution, until the approach of old age has already undermined it. Excess in wine soon deranges the female economy, and occasions sterility; but, happily, the instances are rare. On the other hand, a young man, fond of his bottle, is commonly the father of many children. Drunkenness has not so speedy, nor so extensive an influence in the latter case as in the former. The Americans were, at once, celebrated for drunkenness and for fruitfulness.

If the body suffers from habitual excess, and the increase of population be slightly checked, by this means the mind suffers much more, and the edge of happiness is sooner blunted. It is a wrong idea we form, when we imagine, if the body be strong enough to resist the effects of intoxication, all its effects are resisted. It is not so. Drunkenness is the vice of social dispositions, but it destroys the social affections: an habitual drunkard cannot love; the warm and generous affection of a husband for his wife, the tender fondness of a father for his child, cease to be felt; this deplorable vice has dissolved the tie, by destroying the sense of it.

A drunkard loses all relish for life with his character in it; his dignity, his happiness, and his public spirit, are driven away by its influence. If he speak of generosity, in his cups, in his sober moments, he doubts whether the principle exists in nature.

A drunkard is seldom the promoter of benevolent actions. Thus the liberal youth becomes a churl: he can now no more rejoice with his friend; he cannot weep with him; his habits have robbed him of the atom of deity that was in him; the mind is dead, while yet the body lives and crawls about on the surface of the earth, without feeling an interest in it: it is a noble mansion, once the abode of hospitality and kindness, now untenanted.

Drunkenness is not a local vice, but is practised in every nation on the globe: the Turks, and all Mahometans, excite it by the use of opium; in China and the East-Indies, distilleries of arrac supply, in part, the place of this drug; in countries blessed with a more moderate climate, the vine is cultivated, and yields a pleasing and more safe delirium; in states rude and uncivilized, tobacco, and a variety of roots and herbs, unpleasant in themselves, but possessing an intoxicating property, are eagerly sought

after: but by the inhabitants of the north of Europe, all nature is ransacked, that the means of drunkenness may be diversified. The east and the west give up their drugs, opium and tobacco are used and abused in a variety of ways. Distilleries, vineyards, brewhouses, are all impressed into this service: but, notwithstanding, the civilized parts of the north of Europe abound in children.

When drunkenness may be said to commence, or what constitutes that excess in diet which in any measure abridges the period of human life, or in any way lessens the principle of increase, it is difficult to ascertain. Under certain circumstances, the plainest and most common food has the effect of ardent spirits, and if frequently repeated, would as soon break up the constitution. A bason of broth is too strong for a person who has been starved; it occasions giddiness, and every symptom of intoxication: Dr. Beddoes relates the circumstance of a collier, who had been confined three days in a coal-pit, on whom a mess of broth had this effect. Many similar facts are related by other authors: the most striking of which is, the case of Capt. Bligh, who was sent to Otaheite to obtain some plants of the bread-fruit tree,

and convey them to the West-Indies. The crew mutinied on the passage, and forced the captain, and those who adhered to him, into the boat, with a very small stock of provisions, and abandoned them: an ounce of bread a day was all they subsisted on for some time. On the fortieth day they arrived at New Holland, where some of the men got on shore, and ate a few berries, which so intoxicated them that the captain believed they were poisoned; but was soon convinced of the innocent nature of the fruit, by seeing some birds eat of the same, and in a little time the men awoke from their stupor.

Opposed to this irritable condition, is the state of the man who can drink a bottle of strong wine without sensible effect. The one is too soon moved, the other with too much difficulty. Health, enjoyment, and usefulness are lessened in both: he, whom an onion intoxicates, has neither the strength of body or the vigour and firmness of mind, proper to man; on the other hand, when a bottle of wine does not exhilarate, a stimulus has become familiar which is already injurious, and soon will be destructive. There is a proper mean to be observed; health is an object of the first consideration, and nature points out the method of its preservation; rest

and food are both necessary to the recovery of lost strength; consequently, one should be in proportion to the other, and it is impossible to lay down rules on this head.

In England, animal food once a day, with a pint of beer, is in general sufficient for all the wants of nature: by being thus limited, work does not soon fatigue; health and vigour are long preserved; a cumbersome load of flesh is guarded against; and the mind is not oppressed by itself. A much stronger diet induces feebleness; those who indulge in it, find it necessary to walk slowly, because their breath is short, their strength is soon overcome, and they seek the shade because heat oppresses them. Thus life is first rendered unpleasant, and then destroyed, and population receives a slight check.

The diet suited to this climate, is improper elsewhere: in the East-Indies, vegetables are sufficiently nutritious, and a large proportion of the people confine themselves to their use; the religion of Bramah forbids its votaries animal food, and both inclination and duty enforce the injunction: but Bramah legislated only for a particular country, and his injunctions can only be observed by the people among whom he lived; had he any followers at Kamschatka, they would

perish for want, though fully supplied with the greatest variety of the most nutritious vegetables.

Russians, going on fishing or hunting expeditions, are sometimes detained, through the winter, in the northern provinces of that empire, and find it necessary to abandon all vegetable substances, and to betake themselves to the strongest animal food; hence the custom of drinking fish oil, so common in that country; the great nourishment it imparts, overcomes its loathsomeness. The expenditure of animal heat and life being great, the supply must also be great; hence, in the country we are speaking of, during the winter, flesh meat and wine are advantageously used, at every meal.

In infancy and childhood, in every region of the globe, the powers of nature are weak, and life needs to be solicited to remain in a tenement in which it can exert itself so little; and, consequently, an invigorating diet is proper: in youth, the powers of life are strong, and the plainest food is the most useful: in the decline of life, nature requires a prop, but if it has been previously used, the weight of years soon breaks it. The practice of this country is not conformed to this view of the wants of nature: in infancy,

the least nutritious food is given; in youth, when the passions require to be moderated, they are fanned by animal food and fermented liquors: many a mother, who is afraid of giving meat to a child, will give brandy to a youth. The present custom of the country may render the observance of any particular rule somewhat difficult; but the parents, as the moral guardians of their children, may, and ought to exert their authority.

Youth is the season of happiness; it requires no addition from the pleasures of the table. Water is the proper beverage of youth; with the sole use of it, health, cheerfulness, and character are best preserved. The judgment is weak; and is it not madness to make it weaker by inflaming the passions with fermented liquors and strong animal food? Our treatment of the brute creation is directed with more wisdom, and the object in view is better obtained. A good farmer feeds his young colts with his best fodder, and in the first winter, adds a little corn to it; in the second, he is more sparing; and in the third, the meanest and cheapest food is sufficiently nutritious. The practice of the farmer, is an example which parents ought well to consider.

Again, when a person, fatigued by a hard

day's work, eats an ordinary meal, he is refreshed; if he drinks a little wine, he is still more vigorous and animated; but if he repeats his draught, his vigour is destroyed; like a bow bent too far, the string receives an injury.

The animation occasioned by eating, is the first stage of intoxication; could the stomach contain more food, the mind might, by this means alone, be pushed on to delirium: but a sympathy between the mouth and stomach is called into exercise in mastication, and occasions loathing as soon as the wants of nature are satisfied; but which is not excited by swallowing fluids: hence wine and ardent spirits are drank when food cannot be eaten, and form the after part to all our feasts.

In the first exhilarating glow of vigour, in that sensation of health and energy which a proper repast occasions, reason has the command of the actions; but, by a repetition of stimuli, the animal spirits are pushed beyond reason, and overpower it. To preserve a proper equilibrium should be the study of every one, because the dignity of man can only be preserved in that state; by neglecting this study, life is robbed of much of its comfort, lessened of its usefulness, and shortened in its duration.

So various are the wants of the body, in different regions of the globe, that no other general rule can be given, than this one:---Keep up the vigour of the system by the smallest possible stimulus. Of this, each individual must judge for himself. The diet of an East-Indian would be death to a Greenlander: and the diet which most men can bear, without injury, would be pernicious to a woman.

## OF PROSTITUTION.

THE bad effects of this vice, on population, like that last treated of, are not great. Those unhappy females, who sacrifice their own characters, and betray the honour of the sex, are not only a loss to society, but a pest to it; having rendered themselves incapable of being mothers, and unworthy of becoming wives, they are pitied and despised by the wise and good; but they are, happily, few in number, as it respects the whole population of a country: London may reckon thousands, and smaller cities hundreds, of such pitiable outcasts. But if it be taken into the account, that in Europe, and in every civilized country, the men, in consequence of greater exposure to accidental and violent death, are fewer in number than the women, there must necessarily be some who are unproductive. I do not design to apologize for vice, I merely relate

a fact, generally acknowledged, nor does the conduct of many of my single countrywomen need an apology, if moralists pass them by,---if lighter writers hold them up to ridicule,---if men, who ought to have been better informed, represent the whole sex as destitute of moral principles, as rakes at heart, as shielded in their virtue only by the fear of infamy,---if even more injurious things are said, the conduct of many, who pass unmarried through life, proves the whole to be calumny; and they may be referred to, not as rare and unexpected exceptions to a general rule, but as the standard of the moral principle among the sex.

The virtue of the unmarried, is the virtue of the whole: they have not the privilege of being mothers, but they have the high office of instructing, by their example, the rising generation, and the honour of convincing every one, that in the female character there is much true dignity; they, indeed, walk singly and alone through the world, but the rectitude of their conduct enlivens and cheers the way, whilst detestation and loathing are the sure and just consequences of prostitution.

It would not be an easy task, to point out the nation in Europe in which prostitution is

most prevalent: the English accuse the French, and the French the Neapolitans; but no civilized country, not even America, is exempt from this vice: and if in any nation the extent diminishes, it is to the honour of the government and the happiness of the people.

Drunkenness destroys the worth and shortens the period of human life, and is most practised by men; prostitution still more, if possible, degrades and debases the female character: but neither of these vices essentially affect population. Were there no drunkards, and no prostitutes, there would not be many more children; and besides these, no other vice has any direct effect: a thief, or a perjurer, are not less prolific in consequence of their crimes. I shall, therefore, close my remarks on vice, as a check to population, and pass on to the consideration of another subject.

# OF CELIBACY.

THE civil and religious institutions of the east, and especially of China, so powerfully promote marriage, that the influence of celibacy is looked for in vain. Mr. Hume is of opinion, that few men are unmarried, in China, at the age of twenty; so completely is the principle of increase called into exercise. But, in the estimation of Mr. Malthus, the infrequency of marriage is the most powerful of the checks which, in modern Europe, keep down the population to the means of subsistence;* and, in speaking of England, some motives are urged in justification of this conduct. "A man", says our author, "of a liberal education and small fortune, cannot marry without giving up the society of gentlemen, and ranking with farmers and tradesmen."†

* Mr. M's. Essays, page 351. † Page 301.

Ought such an one ever to have been the associate of gentlemen? He who has just money enough to live in idleness, yet presumes to an equality with the affluent, is a mean and injurious character. Has he good sense? so have farmers and tradesmen; has he a sense of honour? so have they; and his proper and only fit associates are among them. If he aspire higher, he is esteemed a servant, and feels himself a slave.

Another motive is, the fear of poverty. It is proper that a due regard be paid to this subject; but what is the fact? Do the poor calculate with nicety? Do they divide, as Mr. M. represents, their daily earnings, which is just enough to support themselves, between four or five others, and shrink from marriage? Is the period of love with them the period of calculation; and the fear of evil believed to be more than an imaginary fear? It would increase their happiness were it so: but the poor are always inconsiderate. Is their climate inhospitable and rude, and their subsistence mean and tasteless, they are not induced to relinquish the hope of finding pleasure in a family. The natural and necessary difficulty in obtaining one description of good, is not a reason with them to abandon

another. The fear of poverty is never felt by a poor man, it is the rich who are in bondage to it. A year of bad trade, or a reduction in wages from any cause, may, for a time, suspend a marriage; but habitual poverty, however great, has not this effect: no person, who has never been richer, thinks himself too poor to marry.

Thus it appears that celibacy is not practised by the great mass of society, from the fear of the consequences of marriage. In the middle rank of life, the fear of poverty is strongly felt; but is it even here a motive for celibacy? Is it a a motive with the female sex? poverty to the wife is more dreadful than to her husband: it is of the mother the children ask their food; it is she who attends them in sickness, and then to be without the means of assisting, is to her the worst form of misery, it is to stand by the margin of a river, and see a calm, still current engulph her child, from which her arm was once strong enough to have rescued it. It is the wife whose eyes are constantly met by the sad tokens of her situation, all around her speaks poverty. But are many women deterred from marriage by the fear of these evils? if they are not, I presume none are. The advice of friends, or the inordinate love of riches, or vicious habits,

may deter some; but the virtuous, the industrious, and the moderate, of either sex, seldom dread poverty, nor have they cause.

Conjugal infelicity is another motive to celibacy; it is not urged by Mr. M., but I thought it proper to mention it: it certainly exists in many instances. But there is also an infelicity in celibacy: to the bachelor two alternatives present themselves, either to live in a perpetual conflict of the passions, or in the vicious indulgence of them: if the first be preferred, the health is injured, the mind oppressed, and the best feelings of the heart never called into exercise: if the other, the unhappy votary soon finds that a brutal passion degrades him; disgusted at his conduct, he laments at once the loss of character and of happiness; the affections, which are so well calculated to refine, to animate, and to dignify the man, are unfelt by him, for love is destroyed by lust; he foolishly imagined that sensual gratification was the chief, if not the only pleasure, in sexual intercourse; he has tried it, and been deceived; he has bartered away pleasures, which would have increased with his years, for a gratification which never lasts; a void is felt which drunkenness cannot fill, and marriage is contracted when it cannot be happy,

even setting aside the compunctions of conscience.

The virtuous bachelor has by far the advantage: he hears the voice of nature and starts back frighted: reasons, which have been mentioned, and which he thinks prudent, present themselves, and he resolves to follow them, and gains a character, of which, to say the best, is not of the highest order. The man who loses one of his senses is an object of pity, but more so is he who locks up the best feelings of his heart in perpetual ice, and refuses to enjoy the happiness his nature is capable of. The cup is presented, of which he is afraid to drink: but his sentiments may, and commonly do, alter, and the good he refused is enjoyed.

The debauchee, on the other hand, is a mere spendthrift, who, for a present gratification, throws away all prospect of future good; he cuts down the tree that he may pluck the fruit; virtue is a stranger to his thoughts, and the pleasures of mutual affection can never be enjoyed; he has cast away the more valuable, and retained the meaner part; both might have been enjoyed.

Such is celibacy: but marriage is the natural condition of man; it was designed and is calcu-

lated for happiness, but it may be abused, and thus its end is not always answered.---To enter into the causes of matrimonial infelicity, does not suit my present purpose; I shall satisfy myself with saying, that the principal cause is, a struggle for power: the mutual study to please, which is the charm of courtship, by not being made the business of life, is the principal source of the evil of it.

I have been induced to make these remarks, because Mr. M. so frequently speaks of celibacy with approbation; and considers it as an obligation of such easy performance, that a few prudential maxims are all that are necessary to oppose to the strong laws of nature. But nature is not soon conquered; nor is happiness so easily possessed, when means designed by nature to promote it, are dispensed with. But that part of this subject which most affect the leading arguments of Mr. M's. publication, is the check celibacy is of to population.

That the principle of increase is not called fully into exercise in any European state, cannot be denied; nor is it in America; and it is only by comparison that we are to judge. The baneful institutions in catholic states, which interdict marriage; and the military establishments in

all, have a somewhat similar effect on the morals and population of a country. America has had neither of these evils to contend with, yet she has not been wholly exempt from the effects of celibacy. When the spirit of enterprise and the love of liberty colonised America with Europeans, the natural timidity of the female sex would operate as a hinderance to their embarking in equal number with the men; even at this day, when the hardships the first settlers experienced are removed, the number of female emigrants is not very great: consequently, in the early periods of the American states, celibacy was not an optional but a necessary act: what proportion this number bore to the unmarried in Europe, I have not the means of ascertaining, nor is it very important; for we have a striking instance in China, that it is not to celibacy that we are to look for the leading, the permanent check to population, for China suffers a mere nothing from this cause, yet her population does not increase.

The motives to celibacy, though they often arise from a love of gain, or of dissipation, yet in some the motive is of the most honorable nature; it may be to administer comfort to an aged parent, or to prosecute some useful study,

or to accomplish some beneficial purpose; in either of these cases, celibacy is a virtue. There are others who remain single from the want of those passions which lead to marriage; others, from the fear of propagating diseases which themselves are subject to; and others from various motives. But on the whole, we may conclude, in the language of Anacharsis,---that very weighty reasons may authorise a Spartan not to marry, but in his old age he must not expect to be treated with the same respect as the other citizens. Vol. 2. p. 487.

OF

# UNWHOLESOME OCCUPATIONS.

Unwholesome occupations are frequently mentioned by Mr. M., but no definition is given, no precise meaning affixed to the term. Without entering into a discussion of the subject, I may venture to say, that very few occupations are necessarily unwholesome; but as they are now conducted, all such as confine the persons employed in them to their houses, are of this description, and such as are sedentary, are the most so: at the head of this list may be placed shoemakers, tailors, basket-makers, &c. But the occupation to which the eyes of the public are directed with the most watchful jealousy, is the manufacturing of cotton or woollen cloth: in the buildings in which these manufactories are conducted, disease, in a thousand forms, is supposed to be engendered, and to lurk in every apartment.

The question is confined to a narrow point: Is the employment prejudicial to health, or is it not? To answer this question requires personal knowledge; I shall therefore be excused in saying, that during three years I have attended with considerable care to the diseases of the poor of the town of Stockport, and in that period have not seen fewer than five thousand sick persons, who then were or had been employed in manufacturing cotton, and I have endeavoured to investigate the nature and origin of their complaints.

As children are admitted to work at the age of eight or ten years, it might be expected that the injurious influence of their occupation would at that tender age be most apparent; on this account I have attended much to them, and I do not scruple to declare, that children so employed are as healthful as those of the poor brought up in great towns usually are, and more so than those that are apprenticed to tailors, shoemakers, or basket-makers: it is true, their countenances are pale and delicate, so are all children kept within doors; their clothes, covered with cotton, give them a forlorn appearance, but their health is not injured by their work.

What has been said of children applies with equal force to adults.

But there is one circumstance respecting cotton factories, which the public, even from the above statement, is not prepared to expect. It is well known that a warm climate is favorable to health, and especially to the health of those whose constitutions are delicate and inclined to consumption; for whom, physicians of the soundest judgment recommend, if a foreign climate cannot be visited, to produce an artificial atmosphere of due heat and of improved salubrity, which is effected by increasing the proportion of carbonic acid gas. What is thus attained with considerable expense and continued care, is the very air, the very circumstance of some of the rooms of a cotton factory, the best of which is the winding room; the air of this room is rendered warm for the accommodation of those employed in it, and receives carbonic acid gas from the fermenting flour in which the yarn is boiled previously to the process of winding: Thus health appears where disease was looked for.

The proprietors of a cotton factory a few miles from Manchester, between three and four years since, engaged a number of children from

the workhouses in London and other places, to be employed in their service; they now amount to nearly 200: when they first came down, their countenances were sallow, and their whole appearance betokened ill health; they are now fine, vigorous, healthy children, not one of whom has died, yet the air they have breathed has been that of a cotton factory: and when any are out of health, especially if marks of consumption appear, they are employed in the winding room, and a return to health is anticipated with more confidence than in the most commodious dwelling house: the rooms allotted to other processes are more or less healthy as they are more or less dusty. But I am unacquainted with any process more dusty than the thrashing or grinding of corn, or the dust more injurious. On the whole, cotton factories, as they are now conducted, are not unfriendly to health.

But it is proper I should give some account of the 5000 sick persons who have applied to me. They were not children, worn down with labour and dying of their hardships, a very small proportion of my applicants were at that period of life, perhaps not more than there would have been had there been no manufactories; nor have they been men, whose constitutions

had suffered by their long services; but they were in by far the greater proportion married women, who, having spent their youth without acquiring a taste or even a knowledge of domestic affairs, pass their time in the most complete ennui imaginable; to beguile which, various injurious habits are fallen into; to which, and not to their previous labour in the cotton factories, they owe their frequent need of medicine.

Occupations more or less injurious to health, or that expose to accidental death, are pursued in every country; but perhaps in America somewhat less so than in Europe; but this is questionable, for if in that country there are no mines, there are bogs and morasses that require draining; if the people are not confined to their houses, their lives are more exposed to sudden death by the nature of their labour.

This subject I here quit for the present, but design at a future period to renew, in an essay on the effects of manufactories on the health, the morals, and the manners of a people.

But before closing this chapter, there is one remark I wish to make, which is of the highest consequence to Mr. M's. theory: if the population of America increase at a rate of at least twenty times as fast as the population of Europe,

on account of the checks to population in that country being so much fewer, the Americans must live to a greater age than Europeans. What is understood by the operation of vice and misery, is premature death; if the Americans are in a great degree exempt from the causes of premature death, it follows, of course, that they live nearly the full term of human life.

Suppose a thousand persons, or say the whole population of a state, live, on an average, to the same age as a thousand persons, or the whole population of another state, the checks to population, the causes of their death, however various, when taken in the aggregate, must consequently have the same force. But if a thousand persons of one country live longer than the same number of another country, it is a proof that premature death is less frequent among them. And I challenge Mr. Malthus to shew, on his principles, an increase in the population of one country to be greater than of another, without shewing fewer instances of premature death: if this be shewn, he shews also a longer average term of life. To make this matter clear, let us state two other cases: suppose two countries of equal population, the one of which has one fourth of its population,

in the course of a generation, cut off by war, famine and pestilence; but the population of the other live out the natural term of their lives; when the sum of the life of each individual of both countries is taken, the people of that country will certainly count the greater number of years which has suffered nothing from premature death. Here, then, follows the question,---are the people of America, taken as a whole, longer lived than those of Europe? If they are not, and I know of no statement which represent them as such, Mr. M. may show how widely spread vice and misery are over the surface of the globe, but he cannot prove that their smaller operation in America is the cause of the rapid increase in the population of that country: yet, it is a fact that needs no illustration, that if vice and misery are but little known in America, and if Mr. M's. theory be true, the registers of that country, however imperfectly kept, will show a people more healthy and longer lived than any in the world besides.---I am prepared to expect that Mr. M. will say, that the greater disposition to celibacy in Europe is the leading cause of the difference in the rate of increase of the population of these two quarters of the globe; but he has not shown this,

and I profess myself ignorant of any material difference in this respect.

It must occur to the recollection of many of my readers, that Mr. M., when speaking of Switzerland and several other countries, takes it for granted, and indeed the case is self-evident, that in proportion as pestilence, or any other powerful check, became less frequent, without regard to the influence of celibacy, the average duration of the lives of the people became greater. All I ask of Mr. M. is, an application of this principle to the people of America.

## OF MISERY.

UNDER the term *misery*, Mr. M. comprises a host of evils, formidable in their nature, and so extensive in their influence, as to appear capable not only of checking the increase, but of destroying the whole race of man. The direct injury done by vice, is but as a drop in the bucket, compared with that done by misery. During the long period of six thousand years in which it has taken up its abode in our world, it has shown its horrid form to every generation; no sooner has one been hurried by it from its proper station than it seizes on another, and forces it down the current of time, grappling with all the evils its name imports; another and another have succeeded, and shared the same fate.

But, happily for man, this prevalent and powerful evil is of his own creating: misery is not forced upon us, it forms no part, it has no

place in the laws by which man is governed. War, famine, pestilence, unwholesome occupations, and a long train of other evils which Mr. M. enumerates under this head, do not constitute a natural or a necessary part in the government of the world.

There is no physical cause of war, none of famine, none of pestilence: when did there a war happen that could not have been prevented? or a famine, that might not have been guarded against? Are not millions of acres of fertile land at the service of man? if they are allowed to lie waste; if that labour is not bestowed upon them which was stipulated in the gift, famine inevitably follows, for the earth is not spontaneously fruitful: but a voluntary evil is distinct from a natural one. Is not indolence a reproach to an individual, because it ends in want? so scarcity, as the consequence of indolence, is a reproach to a government: the people will labour if they are sufficiently protected. It is a disgrace to a nation to want bread; to say so, would be impious, were it not given to us in as great an abundance as we stretch out our hands to receive: we have only to cultivate a sufficient extent of land, and a store may be laid up for many succeeding years.

Pestilence commonly arises out of some act of human folly, or is the consequence of ignorance. War is the parent of pestilence; it follows in its train as one attached to it, as the history of the world too fully testifies. Improvements in the arts of peace have always driven away pestilence, even when it had had long possession of a country. When Bengal was first occupied by the British, the life of a man was not worth more than two monsoons; but the goodness of the situation made its retention desirable; and by discovering the cause of the malady to be in the undrained state of the land, by remedying it the effect ceased, and Bengal is now as healthful as any town in China. The middle states of Europe, about a century and a half ago, and for many preceding years, were visited by frequent returns of pestilential seasons, but now these scourges are happily unknown; the advancement of cultivation, and the generally improved condition of the people, are the causes that have produced this important change. Constantinople, the mother of plagues, was not wasted by them when the sceptre of the Roman government was retained in her palaces; and her present bondage to them, we may fairly infer, originates not in a permanent,

immoveable cause, but in one which it is the duty of the government to enquire into and remedy. The people of the coast of America are almost the yearly victims of this grievous evil, but the interior of that country is free from it; ingenuity will, I doubt not, discover the cause of its local existence, and foresight guard against or prevent it. The West-Indies, the coast of Africa, the Pontian Marshes near Rome, are all nurseries of pestilence; but there is a cause for each, and the cause is in general known.

England, Switzerland, France, are no more naturally exempt from pestilence now, than they were a century and a half ago, yet these scourges approach not the borders of these countries; the same, in another hundred and fifty years, will probably be said of America, and every other place now visited by them, if in that time an improvement takes place in the face of those countries.

There are many other important considerations connected with this subject, which I design to state in a future dissertation. It is sufficient for the present to say, that the world is not visited by plagues at irregular but fixed and certain periods: a comet observes its course, and

approaches our horizon at the time when its appearance is expected; but this cannot be said of plagues, no calculation can be made concerning them, unless from considering the manners and customs of a country.

Plagues are sometimes mentioned in the scriptures, as indicating the displeasure of God; so are wars, and so is famine; but I am not speaking of them in that light, my object is, to consider their ordinary cause. That the subject may be left as free from embarrassment as possible, let the history of the world be read over, and the misery that hath at various times pressed hard upon it be noted down, and the cause enquired into, and I apprehend very little of it will be found to attach to the appointment of God; on the contrary, man will be found at once the cause and the instrument of his own destruction.

Famine and pestilence are the consequences of indolence, and war of selfishness, but neither indolence or selfishness are directed to be the rules of our conduct. At the eventful period of the overthrow of the Roman empire, in which the world lost half its population by war, famine, and pestilence, no supernatural power was called into exercise; the irruption of the barbarians

was the cause, and the evils spoken of, were the consequence: the calamity did not originate in a law of nature, but was contrived in a camp of barbarians. When the Spaniards cut off millions of Americans, by their unmanly and disgraceful conduct towards them, they were alone answerable for their conduct. And when the Saracens scattered misery and death in Poland, and wherever their arms reached, was not this a human act? and might not all the consequences of it have been spared the world? In this way we might argue of other periods of calamity; but enough has been said.

If the condition of the world be such, that the principle of increase cannot be called into full exercise, or if called into exercise, that in a few generations the number of mankind would be so great as not to be able even to stand on the surface of the globe, the preceding remarks cannot be true. Again, if vice, pestilence, or any other evil, included under the general term misery be natural, they cannot be prevented. A community, directed by the precepts and influenced by the spirit of the christian religion, would not be more exempt from vice and misery than others. Allowing this to be the case, the world is not governed at all, or the laws are

insufficient and bad; for if laws be enacted and obeyed, and their intended purpose not answered, it stamps imperfection upon them; which brings the subject to this test, either man is not a moral agent, and vice and misery are laws of nature, or his obeying the laws under which he is placed will procure him a peaceable, a pleasant, and a safe existence in this world; so that the point Mr. M. has to establish is, that vice, misery, and moral restraint are not of our own procuring, but essential to our interest, and that without their aid there is no means of keeping the population of the world within due bounds, no check that can operate without being injurious to our welfare and happiness; it is not enough to say that misery does exist, its necessity must be proved. Any thing less than this cannot answer our author's purpose, or render his principles even plausible.

In the general view I take of the subject, man has sufficient liberty, sufficient power, to keep down the population of any country to any standard he may please by violence and bloodshed; but God has not appointed him to that task; he is not an executioner by nature; and the office never becomes him. A man, covered with blood, destroying the labour of the hus-

bandman, and sowing the seeds of pestilence, is not acting a useful, consequently not a natural or becoming part. If the pages of history are sullied with such characters, their dependents are to be pitied, and they execrated.

I have now followed Mr. M. through the outlines of his theory, and briefly discussed the leading circumstances on which it is founded. My next object is, to follow him into the facts and evidences he adduces in support of it; but I have not thought it necessary to attend our author page by page, but have confined myself to such chapters as are most interesting, and which best illustrate the subject.

OF THE

# CHECKS TO POPULATION

AMONG THE

## *AMERICAN INDIANS.*

THE object Mr. M. has in view in the chapter which treats of the subject before us, and in several that succeed, is to give examples of the truth of the theory he advances: to this end, he transcribes from a variety of authors such instances of the operation of vice, misery, and moral restraint, as are best adapted to his purpose.

In this chapter he presents his readers with an epitome of Dr. Robinson's History of the Customs of the Americans, with the addition of a few extracts rom other authors. But I shall not do justice to Mr. Malthus if I represent his chapters as mere strings of quotations; many of them contain information which imply much

patient research, and which I believe have been thought of considerable weight by the greater number who have read them. But, before entering upon the subject, it may not be improper to enquire into the validity of the authorities from which Dr. Robinson drew the materials for his History of America, and Mr. M. for his chapter on the checks to population in that country.

The earlier historians of America were either Spaniards or in the interest of Spain; their works were designed to be read only by Spaniards, and related to the conduct of their countrymen; and, as a further argument against their ingenuousness, Dr. Robinson informs us, they were mostly illiterate and prejudiced adventurers. *B.* 4, *p.* 48.—The deeds they had to relate were not those of humanity and kindness, but of blood; their office was not to speak of the progress of the human understanding, of happiness, and of honour, but of ignorance, perfidy, and crimes: they doubtless concealed many of the transactions of their countrymen, and put a false gloss on others, but still their general conduct was made public, which, on reaching, was execrated in Europe, and the Spanish character received a foul and indelible stain.

The merchants, ashamed of the conduct they had promoted, but enriched by the fruits of it, applied to the pope to declare the Americans an inferior species of men; creatures that formed a link between the lordly Spaniard and the brute; but this request, by the interposition of the priests, was not complied with. In a struggle of this kind, impartiality could not reasonably be expected in the adherents of either party: but, setting aside the controversy, impartiality was not a feature of those times.

The merchants, and those in their interest, exaggerated the vices, and represented as hideous the customs of the Americans, in order to palliate the crimes committed against them; but the priests, who seem to have been actuated by pure and honourable motives, represent them as amiable and interesting characters, and in this they are supported by Columbus, but they may have gone somewhat into the opposite extreme.

Dr. Robinson, though aware of the extravagant notions and false representations which had been given, has drank too much into their spirit; and with all the softening which his good sense would direct him to give, has, notwithstanding, drawn a picture of the state of

society and manners among the Indians, in colours calculated to excite disgust and abhorrence; and in the same account, rendered still more pointed and partial by the selection of Mr. M., we are struck with horror at their misery.

But besides the partiality with which all events are related when the interest of a party is to be served, there is another source of error not sufficiently noticed, I mean, the spirit of the times and the state of information when a narrative is written. To give a clear idea of what I mean, and to show how it bears on the present argument, I must enquire into the spirit of those writers of any nation who have given to their countrymen the first account of a foreign people.

As soon as a nation emerges from the darkness, and is secure from the alarms and dangers of a savage state, the mind expands and is inquisitive. A wish to know something of the inhabitants of distant countries is felt, not that any expectation is formed, or hope indulged, of improving in useful knowledge by the acquaintance, but such curiosity is common to man.

Travellers are soon found, who, if they are not distinguished for wisdom, cannot be without

enthusiasm, and, strange as it may appear, of whatever country they may be, the same spirit actuates the whole, the same train of incidents, the same marvellous stories, the same monstrous people, are by all mentioned.

As a fair example of what may be found in such writers, I refer to the narrative of Joan de Plano, ambassador to the Tartars in the year 1246: see Hakluyt's Coll. v. 1, p. 61. He writes thus: "Occody Cham built the city of Chamyl, near which is a desert, in which are men who cannot speak, and are destitute of joints to their legs.---Men, resembling dogs, the women being of proper form, are reported to live between Tartary and India.---In the reign of Occody the Russians attacked the Hungarians and Poles, and were defeated; returning from thence, they came to the Perossitie, who, having little stomachs and small mouths, eat not at all, but seething the flesh, receive the steam. They next came to the Samogite, who live by hunting: from thence they proceeded into a country lying near the sea, where they found certain monsters, who, of all things, resembled the shape of men, saving that their feet were like the feet of an ox, and they had men's heads and dogs' faces; they spoke indeed two words like men,

but at the third, they barked like dogs. This nation being conquered, duke Cyrpondon marched with his forces southward against the Armenians; and travelling through certain desert places, they found monsters in the shape of men, who had each of them but one arm and one hand, growing out of the midst of their breast, and but one foot."

Strange and ridiculous as these stories may appear, they are common, as hath been mentioned, to every country; in every language they are told; and by every people, in a half civilized state, believed.

In histories of great antiquity we read of centaurs, sphinxes, and a variety of other monstrous forms; indeed, the further back we go, the more were such notions propagated and credited. The stories told by Joan de Plano, of the Tartars, were told of the people to the north of the Caspian sea by the Greeks: Anacharsis, v. 2, p. 200.--- And the Roman soldiers were terrified at the accounts given of the Germans by the Gauls, and had nearly revolted, rather than meet them in battle.*---Nor were the Jews exempt from this

* Dum paucos dies ad Vesontionem, rei frumentariae commeatusque causa, moratur; ex percunctatione nostrorum, vocibusque Gallorum, ac mercatorum, qui ingenti magni-

credulity; for the men who were sent as spies to Canaan, worked powerfully on the minds of their countrymen, by telling them that they had seen giants.---Of the East-Indians, and of the Americans, the same frightful relations were given; and in applying them to the natives of the Cape of Good Hope, they were, if possible, made more hideous and degrading.---In the island of Ceylon, the natives are said to have ears so long, that when they lie down to sleep, one serves as a bed and the other as a covering.

Many other illustrations might be given, for early histories are full of them: but enough has been said to show what may be expected of travellers who write for prejudiced or ignorant persons.

The next race of travellers soften the strong colouring of this frightful picture, and represent the people they have visited, as not absolutely hideous, but as very uncommon human beings: some with breasts of prodigious length, as

tudine corporum Germanos, incredibili vertute, atque exercitatione in armis esse praedicabant, saepenumero sese cum iis congressos, ne vultum quidem atque aciem oculorum ferre potuisse; tantus subito timor omnem exercitum occupavit, ut non mediocriter omnium mentes animosque pertubaret.

Vulgo totis castris testamenta obsignabantur.

*Cæsar's de Bel. Gal. Lib.* 1. *cap.* 39.

Lithgow relates of the Irish; or as resembling in their persons the letter S, and running faster than a horse, as is noticed by others, of the Hottentots. But on still more correct information being gained, those who were believed to be monsters are found to be men.

That the same stories should be told and believed in every country, is a striking proof that the mind of man is every where the same. The very publication of Joan de Plano, respecting the Tartars, would do extremely well for a Tartar to publish, as containing his travels to some recently discovered country; and whether he adopts it or not, I can venture to predict a striking resemblance between them.---I wish not, however, to be considered as speaking disrespectfully of travellers; those of them who write for the well informed, relate only what they have witnessed; but such as address themselves to the populace, endeavour to interest them, and are themselves often first deceived, expecting to see strange things, they the more readily credit the stories they hear; and where none are informed, it is not difficult to conjecture the nature of the narrative. The travels of Mungo Park are not very popular in our enlightened age and country, for no other reason,

I apprehend, than because they are not more full of marvellous incidents.

Let us carry these ideas with us to the Spanish writers on America: the age in which they wrote was not that in which stories of monsters most delighted, or were most enquired after, or doubtless more would have been found than were; but it was the age of chivalry. Fired with high and romantic notions of the female character, the Spaniards viewed with contempt and abhorrence the stern conduct of the Americans to their women. Tales of their apparently cold indifference, were well calculated to justify to the mother country the conduct of her colonists: a want of gallantry was a want of every virtue; it was the monstrosity of that day. The stories with which the writings of the colonists abound, would never have been related, and could scarcely have been imagined, had it not been for the chivalrous character of the mother country; they were to Spain then, what stories of monsters had been formerly.

Dr. Robinson speaks of the great caution that should be used in reading the Spanish writers; but with all the care which he, as an historian who designed fidelity, has of course observed, his judgment appears to have been

imposed upon, and the customs of the Indians, even as represented by him, are highly improbable. "The condition," he says, "of the women is so peculiarly grievous, and their depression so complete, that servitude is a name too mild to describe their wretched state. A wife, among most tribes, is no better than a beast of burden, destined to every office of labour and fatigue. While the men loiter out the day in sloth, or spend it in amusement, the women are condemned to incessant toil. Tasks are imposed upon them without pity, and services are received without complacence or gratitude. They must approach their lords with reverence; they must regard them as more exalted beings, and are not permitted to eat in their presence. There are districts in America where this dominion is so grievous and so sensibly felt, that some women, in a wild emotion of maternal tenderness, have destroyed their female children in their infancy, in order to deliver them from that intolerable bondage to which they knew they were doomed." *Book* 4, *p.* 92.

Mr. Malthus quotes the above passage verbatim, with the exception of the last sentence, which he writes thus: "There are some districts in America where this state of degradation

has been so severely felt, that mothers have destroyed their female infants to deliver them at once from a life in which they were doomed to such miserable slavery."* Whether this alteration in the sense be allowable, I submit to the candour of our author: a fit of wild emotion is very distinct from a deliberate act.

Such a picture of female wretchedness and misery as is here drawn, had nothing more been related by the Spanish writers, was enough to rouse a nation of chivaliers to madness; but the present sober-minded generation require matters of fact, or at least, of probability. Children may have been murdered in passion, or even by design, but if the practice of infanticide had been so general as to be worthy the notice of an historian, a small state must soon have exterminated itself; and, besides, the disposition to it is contradicted by the established character of the Americans. Dr. Robinson expressly declares, that, "so long as their progeny continue feeble and helpless, no people exceed them in tenderness and care." *B. 4, p. 94.*

As to their women, they are in the situation of all savages, tyrannized over for the protection

* Page 27.

they receive; but they never knew a better state, and they see no one to envy, and much of the misery of civilized societies arises from such comparisons: nor is their happiness lessened by their husbands being below them in education, or different in their habits of life.---Considering the men as in the lowest stage of civilization, I do not know that they can be esteemed either more morose or distant than belongs to that state. Our error in judging of the Americans arises from comparing them with ourselves: they have no suavity in their manners, there is no interchange of courtesies among themselves; their manners are not European, but such as they are, they are common to both sexes, and to the whole tribe, which excludes repining from the minds of the women: how can a woman repine at her condition, who never knew or never heard of a female superior to herself? In their affections, the men are warm and benevolent; they are strangers to avarice; if their views are narrow, their attachment is firm and constant: the whole tribe have but one hope, one fear, one object. Like the ancient Germans, who are celebrated as kind husbands, they admit the women to the public deliberations of the nation; and when war is determined on,

they take a lively interest in it: to animate the warriors, they accompany them through the first day's march; and when the battle is over, the men dispatch a messenger to acquaint the women of their return; and on reaching their habitations, they sing with the heart-felt pleasure of an European,---"Where can a man be better than in the bosom of his family."

Such marks of mutual affection could not be shown were the women unhappy, or if they were of no consideration with the men.

That the American women, like other savages, are in a servile and degraded state, is perfectly true, but in what does their incessant employment consist? Neither the chase nor the battle devolve on them. They manage the domestic concerns; but can these occupy their time? Their children are few, and go naked; their houses and furniture are of the humblest kind, and require but little care; their husbands' dress and their own do not call for labour; they cook the victuals, they fetch home the game, and they assist in cultivating, in a rude and careless manner, a piece of ground, not many yards square, which they plant with Indian corn or manioc, with plantain or potatoes, and this is

all that can be required of them. The labour that can possibly be expended on the establishment of an American Indian, compared with the toil of an European housemaid, admits of no resemblance. All labour, indeed, is irksome to a savage, but the utmost that any one can find or be compelled to do in their own families, will neither shorten life nor lessen fecundity; and they never work for hire; yet their state is represented as "peculiarly grievous."

From the condition of the female sex, as thus described, Mr. M. derives the first check to the population of that people. Their depression, hardship, and labour, he imagines, with Dr. Robinson, to be unfriendly to the office of child-bearing. But it is not, as has been hinted, in the nature of things, that the concerns of a small family should have this effect; besides, were the labour of the American women incessant, and felt to be grievous, whatever effect it might have on their fecundity, they must long since have civilized their country. Constant labour invariably gives birth to ingenious expedients to abridge it, and one invention arises out of another: the improver of an useful art is complimented for his skill, and feels his superiority; others are excited to emulation, and

the path to knowledge is made broad and easy. A few discoveries, made by the Incas of South America, led at once to the civilization of that country; and the incessant labour of the women would infallibly have done the same in the north.

The next check mentioned by Mr. Malthus, is, the libertine lives of the young women,* which all writers allow to be general; but in opposition to this, many very grave historians tell us, that the men have hardly any sexual appetite, and Mr. M. believes them: thus we learn that the young women are prostitutes, but the men are stocks. Such ridiculous nonsense suited the spirit of the times when it was written, but it is high time to have done with it. Love, among savages, is not a refined passion; it is not felt as such; it does not produce that courteous respect to the women which is paid to them when their worth is better known: but polished manners are distinct from passion. The very notion of libertinage in one sex, supposes it in the other. Allowing, then, that the conduct of the young Americans is extremely licentious, what influence has it on population?

* Page 27.

Abortion is said to be procured in case of pregnancy; that may be the fact; but Europeans are ignorant of any means of effecting it within the command of the Americans. But granting this to be partially true, what is the general effect of such conduct? Is it the same as prostitution in Europe? Does it in most instances incapacitate for child-bearing? Certainly not. If we connect the effects of prostitution in Europe with the libertinage of the Indians, we form an erroneous judgment. The Americans are so little informed, and their understandings are so much debased, that they suffer no disgrace, and feel no shame: sentiment has no connexion with their conduct; their intercourse is nothing more than mere animal instinct, which does not lessen fecundity.

If the Americans have no passions, why do they marry? They are not urged to it from a spirit of knight-errantry; nor is it that they may gratify their lusts, for they are unrestrained in this; but they are prompted by the noble and dignified passion of being a husband and a father: a passion distinct from lust, though connected with it. Lust is the corruption of this passion.

Mr. M., not content with the paradoxes of the Spanish and French writers, makes one of

his own: he informs us, that, "one of the missionaries, speaking of the common practice among the Natchez, of changing their wives, adds, unless they have children by them; a plain proof (says our author) that their marriages were in general unfruitful."* Pray how does it happen, where marriages are generally unfruitful, that a state keeps up its population? A moment's consideration ought to have convinced Mr. M., that his "plain proof" could not possibly be true.

The next check mentioned by Mr. M. is, the long period an American mother suckles a child. If this be a check to population, it certainly is a very slight one. Suppose a mother nurses her child three or four years, and in most cases the capacity of suckling has ceased by that time; so that if we take three years as the average period, there is, in an ordinary life, sufficient space for the rearing a pretty numerous family.

The other checks that operate in preventing the birth, or in afterwards destroying the infant, are slight, but cannot be entirely passed over, and are the following: When a mother dies who is suckling an infant, the helpless child is

* Page 27.

buried with her, as no one can be found who will afford to it that protection and care the helplessness of infancy so peculiarly requires; which is at once a loss to the community, and a dreadful consequence of savage manners.—Again, when a child is deformed, there is reason to believe it is exposed; but the number of deformed children born in America cannot be imagined to be greater than elsewhere: but Mr. M. wishes to convey an idea, that their number is much greater, and quotes the authority of Dr. Robinson, who says, "In the Spanish provinces, where the Indians do not live so laborious a life, and are prevented from destroying their children, great numbers of them are deformed, dwarfish, mutilated, blind, and deaf."* I have not an opportunity of consulting Don Ulloa's writings, who is the authority for the remark, but Mr. Winterbotham, referring to the same circumstance, conveys a very different idea, and on authority equally as good. He writes, "The Abbe Clavigero, having made some enquiry respecting this singularity of the Quintans, found that such defects were neither caused by bad humours nor by the climate, but

* Page 29.

by the mistaken and blind humanity of their parents; who, in order to free their children from the hardships and toils to which the healthy Indians are subjected by the Spaniards, fix some deformity or weakness upon them, that they may become useless. A circumstance of misery which does not happen in other countries of America; nor in those places of the same kingdom of Quito where the Indians are under no such oppression. *Hist. Amer. v.* 1. *p.* 113.

Having enumerated the many risques an American runs, either of not having children, or of not being able to foster and protect them in their infancy, Mr. M. goes on to say, that, "when a young savage, by a fortunate train of circumstances, has passed safely through the perils of his childhood, other dangers, scarcely less formidable, await him."* By the language Mr. M. makes use of, we might suppose the mortality of children in America much greater than in Europe, but that is not the case; I have enumerated all the dangers Mr. M. states a young savage to be exposed to, and are they likely to involve so large a proportion in death as to entitle those who escape to be called fortu-

* Page 30.

nate? Let Mr. M. reflect, that a marriage of American Indians is seldom known to produce more than three children; and then let him show, if the perils of childhood be so great, in what way the tribes are supported.

But what are the dangers which are scarcely less formidable which await him on his approach to manhood? We are informed, they are common diseases; which originate partly from the gluttony the Americans indulge in when the chase has been successful, and in the abstinence they are obliged to practise when the game elude their cunning or their skill. Another source of disease is, the swampy ground, which generates epidemic diseases. The small-pox also, since their acquaintance with Europeans, has been introduced among them: and they are said to be ignorant of the cure of some of the diseases to which they are subject. All this may be perfectly true, but is not an European youth also exposed to many diseases? and is his constitution more able to resist them? Nursed in the lap of ease, and in the midst of plenty, sickness, in a variety of complicated forms, assails his constitution, from which the young savage is entirely exempt. The children of the Scotch highland peasants are not much more delicately treated, or more

exempt from disease, than the young Indians, yet we do not hear that it is by mere good fortune that they escape the dangers of their childhood and youth.

Capt. Vancouver is next quoted, to show the extent and fatal consequences of epidemics among the Indians. The captain traversed, from New Dungeness, 150 miles of coast, without seeing the same number of inhabitants, but deserted villages were frequently observed. About Port Discovery, the skulls, limbs, ribs, backbones, and some other vestiges of the human body, were scattered promiscuously in great numbers.*

Allowing this to be the case, the survivors must have been, on Mr. M's. theory, in the highest possible state of happiness; subsistence would now be in the greatest abundance, and the population would double itself in a very few years. But how can this have been with only three children to a marriage? and I know of no writer that states them at a greater number. Mr. M. says, "their marriages seldom produce above two or three children;"§ and in support of the fact, quotes Robinson, Burk, Charlevoix, and Latifau.

* Page 32. § Page 25.

We are next informed, that "those who escape the dangers of infancy and disease are constantly exposed to the chances of war."* War is the worst and most destructive scourge that afflicts the human race, because it is the parent of many others, and is detestable every where; but among savages it is perhaps less so than among polished people; they cannot be degraded, they cannot be corrupted; but whilst it is the natural tendency of other affections to improve the morals of a refined people. When the iron car of war is drawn over a land, morality shrinks and withers before it. A civilized people also are in greater danger of famine and pestilence from it. But as to the direct and immediate effects of war, I do not know whether the savage or the civilized nation feels it the most severely: nor do I know that it is of any consequence, as to the blood shed in war, with what weapons two combating states are armed, provided both are armed alike; tomehawks, or clubs, or bayonets, are all equally fatal, if directed with skill. The American mode of warfare, and their notion of honour, tends much to screen their persons; but the frequency

* Page 33.

of their engaging in it, made the number of those who fell, very considerable.

It is unnecessary to enquire further into this subject, for, however sanguinary their wars may have been, it is their permanent effect on the population of a nation, that interest us. Men, by being most exposed, are by far the greatest sufferers by war. In America polygamy is allowed of, so that if the women are more numerous than the men, they are still mothers; and thus the loss of population by war, is greatly lessened in its ultimate consequence. It is on this principle that the late sanguinary conflict in France did not lessen the actual population of that country. Chastity, which never had been considered a virtue in Greece, now ceased to be one in France, and unmarried mothers became very numerous; before the revolution, they bore a proportion to the married of 1 in 47, but during its continuance they increased to 1 in 11.

Another check to the population of the American Indians, is stated to be, famine. In the larger islands of America, and in those parts of the southern continent where corn had, before the Spaniards took possession of them, for some time been the principal support of the inhabitants, it is highly probable that, notwithstanding

the excellent agricultural regulations of their respective governments, that famine occasionally swept off part of the inhabitants. But the ruder states of North America, to which Mr. M. in a great measure confines his attention, are, by their mode of living, less exposed to this evil. Agriculture is practised to supply but a part of their wants, hunting and fishing serve as their chief support. Should their crop of corn fail, or be destroyed in war, the forest is still well stocked with game, and the rivers with fish. A hunter, overcome in war and driven from his village, can never be deprived of subsistence; he is always in the midst of that supply on which he depends. And it does not appear that subsistence is difficult to procure; for, as often as the British colonies were on good terms with the natives, they cheerfully supplied them with provisions, and seemed themselves not to know of scarcity; Mr. M. speaks of famine, and doubtless their improvidence exposed them to want, but as they could procure subsistence in exchange for trinkets, they could command it to satisfy their own necessities.---Corn is uncertain in its increase, and precarious in its preservation, and the warlike nation that depends upon it for subsistence, is in danger of suffering want;

but game and fish produce their young in their season, and are caught when they are required for food; the forest and the river always give them protection; they are not affected by wars, in which the labour of the husbandman is destroyed. And in the country of which we are now speaking, they are not much molested by animals of prey, such as exist are few and feeble. In these forests the deer is almost as safe as under the protection of man, and its fawn skips and gambols by its side with almost as little annoyance. Nor are their rivers ever forsaken by the thousands of fish that are bred in them.

Such are the checks Mr. M. enumerates, as those which prevent an increase of population among the American Indians. By their means the population is always kept down to the level of the subsistence; or, in other terms, is made stationary; or if there are any oscillations, the stationary point is never exceeded. But in this very country, in the immediate vicinity of these very people, were situated the British colonies, composed of individuals from most of the states of Europe, and of characters as diversified as the nature of man admits: they were exposed to the hardships of an untried climate and an uncul-

tivated country, themselves in danger from the diseases engendered in the swamps, of which Mr. Malthus speaks, and their children to equal if not greater hazard than the young savages: if they passed through the perils of their childhood, other evils also awaited them, they were now called to assist their parents, who were exposed, not only to the evils mentioned, but to repeated attacks of the natives.

If the History of America be carefully read over, an impartial person will have no hesitation in saying, that the lives of the natives were equally as secure, and the probability of their increasing in number as great, as of those who had but recently taken up their abode among them.

But there is something unpleasant, something that does not comport with the dignity of philosophy, to poise and balance sums of misery against each other. Nor does this mode of judging satisfy the mind; for, independent of the principles it involves, we never can obtain by it any satisfactory explanation of the fact. That a few persons leaving their native country, and exposing themselves to many new and unguarded dangers in a distant land, should multiply faster than they would have done at home,

or than those who had long been accustomed to the climate, (this is an exception to Mr. M's. principles so strong, as to amount of itself almost to a refutation of them), there is then some hidden cause that remains to be developed, some fixed and fundamental principle of the human economy yet to be explained.

I am far from wishing that any of the preceding remarks should be construed into an approval of the sentiments of those gentlemen who have represented the manners and the feelings of persons in the lowest stage of civilization, as objects of imitation and desire; on the contrary, I would say, to be ignorant, ill informed, and barbarous, is not to be in the road to happiness. A savage is a man, but without the blessings common to humanity; a dull round of pursuits, of little utility, occupy his life; the trust committed to him, that of breaking up and cultivating the ground, he but ill discharges; and until this be done, he is not in the way, he has no claim to happiness. With him a day of labour is succeeded by a week of idleness; and idleness, with anxious care, is misery: and such is the life of a savage. See him

> "retire unseen,
> "To ponder o'er his gather'd spleen,
> "And meditate revenge."

And a better idea will be formed of the cause of the thin population of America at the time of its discovery, than by prying into and analysing the evils Mr. M. has represented that country a prey to.

I shall now close my remarks on this chapter, which appears to me one of the most important in the whole of our author's publication. I have not thought it necessary, on any point, to bring forward a weight of opposite testimony to that Mr. M. has produced, for this would have left the matter in suspense; but I have confined my observations to the principles of things, and to the nature of man. Whether I have done justice to the subject I am uncertain; but I am persuaded, if Mr. M's. chapter be attentively considered, whether the preceding remarks be received or not, so many objections to it will arise, as to shake the confidence of that gentleman's firmest adherents. The picture he draws is so overcharged, the facts are so distorted, and the whole is a tale of such unmixed woe, that it can only be read in connexion with eastern allegories, as a fiction, the work of a heated imagination, embodying misery, and directing to its residence. But even allowing that a fair and correct representation has been given of the American Indians,

the leading principles the work was written to establish are refuted: a great mortality is, in a hundred places, stated to be a sure pledge of an increase in marriages and in children; it is an unceasing theme, alluded to in every chapter, and vauntingly made the test of the truth of what is advanced. But in America, death, in a thousand forms, is made to do its office: but no writer ever noticed even a temporary improvement in the state of the people; no period when marriages became more frequent, or children more numerous; no period when former evils, which is Mr. M's. doctrine, increased their present comforts.

## OF THE
# CHECKS TO POPULATION
### AMONG THE
## *Ancient Inhabitants of the North of Europe.*

THEORY, founded on truth, gains support by every examination to which it can be submitted; if the facts on which it rests are placed in different connexions, and viewed under various circumstances, still the same leading features present themselves. In the chapter before us, Mr. Malthus has an opportunity of trying the theory he advances by this test. The ancient Germans, of whom he principally treats, lived under the same laws, observed the same customs, subsisted by the same means, and were exposed to the same calamities, as the North American Indians. Like them, too, they were just learning the rudiments of civilization; and were there no other, this circumstance alone would produce a resemblance in character; for the rudiments of

government, like those of science, admit, in the subjects of them, of no distinction. Enter a school, where the alphabet can scarcely be repeated, and as there is no scope for the display of talent, so none is expected; a future Newton, should there be one, is not distinguished from the most arrant blockhead. Let the idea of a school be transferred to a nation, while yet rude and barbarous; during that age the same common character runs through the whole, and applies to every nation not better informed.

In the first giving way of midnight darkness, in the first glimmering of light, all remote objects are involved in obscurity; no one can see them more clearly than another; and the slight knowledge gained rather tends to confound than to direct. Thus circumstanced, no one attempts to deviate from the common track; the footsteps of one are a guide to the whole. But when more knowledge is acquired, when the sun has risen above the horizon, the prospect enlarges, objects are seen more distinctly; the footsteps of another are no longer sought after, which lays the foundation of a diversity of opinions, and gives loose to a variety of tastes and inclinations. It is now that the man of genius is discerned; now the rudiments of the republic or the

monarchy are laid, and every succeeding age increases the difference between them. But in darkness there is no distinction.

The Germans, described by Cæsar and Tacitus, and the Americans by Columbus, Charlevoix, Ulloa, and others, are so nearly alike in the state of their knowledge, in their character, and in their conduct, that the same pen describes both. The light each had attained was so little, that it is impossible they could widely have differed. The miseries of Germany were the miseries of America; the enjoyments of Germany were the enjoyments of America. Mr. M., charmed with the condition of the Germans, has translated from Tacitus part of what he relates concerning them; to which, by way of comparison, I shall connect what is known of the American Indians, on the same subjects.

"The Germans," he translates, "do not inhabit cities, or even admit of contiguous settlements." The same may be said of the Americans.---"Every German surrounds his house with a vacant space." If they are not contiguous, it cannot be otherwise.---"They (the Germans) content themselves almost universally with one wife." So do the Americans; but polygamy was

allowed of in both countries.---"Their (the German) matrimonial bond is strict and severe, and their manners, in this respect, deserve the highest praise." The same applies to the Americans.---"They live in a state of well-guarded chastity; corrupted by no seducing spectacles, or convivial incitements." The Americans have no seducing spectacles, and their women are not allowed to be present at a feast.---"Adultery is extremely rare." So it is among the Americans.---"No indulgence is shown to a prostitute, neither youth, beauty, nor riches can procure her a husband; for none there look on vice with a smile, nor calls mutual seduction the way of the world." In America the morals are less pure, but more friendly to population.---"To limit the increase of children, or put to death any of the husband's blood, is accounted infamous; and virtuous manners there, have more efficacy than good laws elsewhere." The Americans are very tender over their offspring, and every tribe is rejoiced at an increase of its number; though Mr. M. informs us, some of the ruder tribes make a point of not rearing more than two of their offspring*. As it is impossible

* Page 28.

this should be the case for many successive generations, I pass on to the next observation.---"Every mother (in Germany) suckles her own children, and does not deliver them into the hands of servants and nurses." The same is true of the Americans.---"The youths partake late of the sensual intercourse." The Americans do not greatly differ in this respect.---"The more numerous a man's kinsmen and relations are, the more comfortable is his old age; nor is it any advantage to be childless."* And is it an advantage any where?

Here Mr. Malthus terminates his translation of the account given by Tacitus: had he gone on and traced the manners of the Germans even to the burial of the dead, a counterpart might have been produced in the customs of the Americans. But as our author has satisfied himself, it next follows that we attend to his inferences from this representation of their manners.

He thinks the state of the Germans so prosperous and happy, that "it is difficult to conceive a society with a stronger principle of increase in it."† A little further on, where it is designed to show the capacity of Germany to

* Page 77. † Page 78.

sustain the drains made on her population, Mr. M. says, "the succession of human beings appears to have been most rapid; and as fast as some were disposed of in colonies, or mowed down by the scythe of war and famine, others rose in increased numbers to supply their place."* And concludes with this general observation, that, from the above premises, "the north never could have been exhausted."†

In particularizing the account, our author informs us, "The rate at which the Germans increased was the same as that of the European colonists in America." And he goes on to say, "the propriety and even necessity of applying this rate strikingly appear from that valuable picture of their manners,"‡ which has just been given. But, unfortunately for our author, in the very next page he informs us, "It is not probable for two successive periods together, or even for one, the population within the confines of Germany ever doubled itself in 25 years."‖ If they never doubled their number in 25 years, they never increased at the rate of the American colonies, which has been stated to be proper and necessary. But I will not dwell on little incon-

* Page 79. † Pa. 77. ‡ Pa. 77. ‖ Pa. 78.

sistencies, as all authors are liable to them; my object is, to attend to the main scope of the argument.

From the above statement, it is evident that Mr. M. thinks the circumstances of the ancient Germans extremely friendly to population; and the question naturally arises, why has not the same reasoning been applied, and the same inferences drawn, from the state of the American Indians? A similarity in all the great outlines of their affairs, and in general in the detail of the minutest circumstance, suppose a coincidence of events, an uniformity of consequences; but it has not suited Mr. M's. theory so to state the subject. Whilst the German population, like a torrent, overflows or breaks down its banks, and deluges the neighbouring country, the American moves slowly on, and the slightest resistance keeps it in its course: the one can lose half its whole amount without permanent diminution, the stream by which it is fed flows with such rapidity, as very soon to make up the loss; the other passes languidly on, almost lost among the rocks and breakers which form its bed, and if a small stream were diverted, its loss could never be supplied. The messengers of death are not half powerful enough in Ger-

many to restrain the population within due bounds; but in America the population can with difficulty make head against them.---Such are the pictures drawn, the representations given, of these two countries.

But before we finally decide on this subject, or accuse Mr. M. of unfairness, it may be proper to enquire what effect the various bodies of emigrants, that went from Germany, had on the state of those who were left. Whether the checks to the increase of their numbers became less; and whether by this means some advantage was not gained over the Americans.

When the Roman empire attracted the notice of the inhabitants of the north of Europe, the principal part of whom lived within the confines of Germany, and the idea of a rich booty and a fertile soil animated their desires, many were eager to seize upon them, and a numerous body of armed men, with their wives, their children, and their cattle, left their native country, no more to return. Formerly the Germans had been accustomed to wars among themselves; did this prevent their recurrence, by diverting their attention, or directing it to new objects? Certainly not. The forty states, into which the country was divided, continued dis-

tinct and separate, at least till towards the close of the contest; among whom the same antipathies were retained, the same inclination to war continued, and the same motives to it existed that had ever prevailed, and new grounds of contest arose: for after various colonies had precipitated themselves upon, and were lost in the adjacent provinces, Tacitus mentions it to have been the policy and practice of the Romans to foment discord between the states; and in one battle, in consequence of such an intrigue, 40000 fell.---War was the common delight of the Germans; it was the business of their lives; no loss of numbers in any way abated the zeal or daunted the courage of a tribe: they retained the love of war, and the practice of it, as well among themselves as against the Romans, through the whole period of that part of their history we are speaking of. Thus we find the spirit of emigration did not produce harmony. But was it not beneficial in some other way? I apprehend not. Scarcity still threatened the land. If those who emigrated were influenced by the hope of meeting with countries spread over with plenty, in which they might riot, those who remained behind had only the produce of Germany, which the others had aban-

doned, and which was extremely scanty and insufficient, unless procured by the toil of the husbandman or the vigilance of the hunter; and had not such labour been irksome, the whole tribe might have lived together in the enjoyment of the greatest plenty, for their numbers were few.

At the outset of the struggle with Rome, Gibbon informs us, the fighting men in the whole north of Europe may be computed at a million, who, like the Americans, subsisted by hunting and agriculture. The systems on which these were conducted it is now useless to enquire into; but so far as we know of them, they claim but little superiority over those on which the Americans acted. One observance of the Germans would, so long as it was continued, inevitably keep them on an equality with the most savage nations, though they lived in the vicinity of the most civilized; I allude to the custom of permitting the same plot of ground to remain in the hands of one person for no longer time than a year, lest he should become too much attached to it and grow careless of war. No custom could have been better adapted for continuing the brutality of a people. Improvements in farming were by this system wholly excluded;

and the study of this art seems to have been that which gave rise to the civilization of the world; it is the first token that is given of an advance from barbarism, and it denotes the progress that is made. What nation ever gained in civilization that neglected agriculture? It is from the agriculturalists that a town is supplied with people; and if the fountain be poisonous, its streams will injure where they flow, and assimilate a stagnant pool to itself. To forbid the farmer to improve his land, is to exclude knowledge; and the states of Germany acted on this principle. There was one circumstance, however, in which the Germans had a superiority over the Americans, their forests gave shelter to cattle that were easily domesticated, and became private property, of which the Americans had none.

But it is unnecessary to make comparisons of this kind; for the great and leading pursuit of both being war, every circumstance of their lives, by having a reference to this object, could not fail of producing the greatest similarity of character; and any partial advantages would be swallowed up and lost in this prevailing bias of their minds.

Of the million of fighting men, suppose half

emigrated with their wives and families, and suppose a scarcity of subsistence to have been in part their motive for this conduct, what effect would it produce on the circumstances of those who remained behind? The spontaneous productions of nature would not be greater, and if they were, they could not be used as articles of human food; labour was still an obligation which could not be dispensed with, and was not abridged: those who had emigrated took with them their flocks, and they left no corn, it was still as much as ever the business of each individual to provide subsistence for his family: and as there never was a want of land to cultivate, so a thinner population gave them no advantage. Was any one disposed to exchange labour for subsistence, the nature of the exchange would no more have been understood than it was in America, for both were ignorant of the mechanical arts and of the use of money, and had no medium of exchange whatever. A discontinuance of the chase, a smaller competition in hunting, was the only bequest made by the emigrants; it was the only way in which the situation of those who remained was improved, and this was to be defended by arms, for being reduced in number, the neighbouring tribes, as

was their custom, disputed with them the right to the ground, and most likely, in many instances, deprived them of it.

"An accession of strength," says Mr. M., when speaking of the American Indians, but which he here overlooks, "in one tribe, opens to it new sources of subsistence, in the weakness of its adversaries; and, on the contrary, a diminution of its numbers, so far from giving greater plenty to the remaining members, subjects them to extirpation and famine, from the irruption of their stronger neighbours."*

So that on the whole, emigration was an injury rather than a benefit to a tribe. Besides, who were the persons that emigrated? were they the old and infirm, or the indolent? No: emigration was a voluntary act, and would be made choice of by the young and middle-aged; by the most active, enterprising, and robust; by those who, being able to attack one country, were competent to the defence of another. Those then who remained would consequently be the infirm, the young, the fearful, and the decrepid.

Under such circumstances Mr. M. supposes population to have gone on increasing at a most

* Page 87.

rapid rate, and in a very few years to have filled up the places of those who had abandoned them. But even if what has been advanced be of no weight, such a statement is not congenial to the character of the Germans, or the nature of things. An increase in children supposes an increase of care and toil, food must be provided for them; but to furnish the means of subsistence to a numerous family of unproductive members would not be deemed, by a barbarous German, or by a savage of any nation, an improvement in his condition; he would feel indignant at the task. The labour he willingly bestowed, was never more than sufficient to supply the wants of a small family, to double which, without a change of habits, was impossible, and a change of habits implies a change of character; a people once accustomed to industry, lose their fierceness, and cease to be barbarous: had the Germans grown fond of labour, Rome would not have fallen by their arms. To emigrate was a voluntary act, but the motive to it would have been lost if the love of war had been exchanged for that of a domestic nature---if a delight in carnage gave place to that of a numerous offspring.

But, to continue the supposition, that half the population of a country had left it, is it

rational to expect that the remaining half would produce and rear as many children as the whole body when together? especially if it be taken into the account, that one motive for emigrating was not a want of room, but an unwillingness by labour to procure the means of subsistence. Did the fecundity of the women increase by the circumstance? Or were the children more healthy or better treated? Or by what new means were they nurtured and brought up in such increased numbers? The blood of a German was always respected, and no restriction was ever put, by the customs of the country, on the number of their offspring; but some improvement must have taken place in their management, some increase in the fecundity of the women, if the event Mr. M. speaks of had been accomplished.

If the German states were not more exempt from war or famine, in consequence of their contest with the Roman power, it follows, of course, that they were not from pestilence. Hence arises another question: in what way was the population of these states kept within the means of subsistence before the invasion of the Roman provinces? Mr. M. expressly declares, that the north never could have been emptied of

people, notwithstanding the many drains that were made from it: the principle of increase he supposes, for it is only supposition, to have been so great, that the stream which had flown for 200 years, and emptied its foul stream on the fairest portion of the globe, would flow on to the end of time undiminished at the fountain.

Robinson, Gibbon, Mallet, and other philosophers and historians, are of a contrary opinion, and speak of the north as in some parts an entire desert from emigration. But without enquiring into this subject, what became of this mighty river before it overflowed its banks? Mr. M. is silent on this subject. But if it can be shown that the states of Germany, during a certain period, doubled their population in 25 years, something ought to be said to prove that they did not increase so fast at an earlier period. Did vice, misery, and moral restraint prevent it? in that case the diminished influence of such agents might be shown when they received a new direction, and the same end was attained by a diversity in the means. But this has not been done; and therefore I conclude that the state of the population of Germany is not explained by the principles advanced by Mr. M.

I have now followed Mr. M. through the

leading facts and arguments contained in two chapters, expressly written to exemplify and illustrate his theory; and, on a hasty perusal, the design in both appears to have been accomplished. But on a more attentive consideration, that which dazzled the imagination and confounded the judgment, is discovered to be not the strength and force of the argument, but the ability of the author, exciting a sentiment which the facts, considered in themselves, do not convey. The research of the philosopher, extracting truth from doubtful evidence, does not appear; in place of it, I fancy I am reading the speech of a pleader, who is endeavouring to say all that is favorable of his friends, and all that is discreditable of his antagonists.

Our author, to keep up the idea of a counsellor, is retained on two causes, resembling each other in all their leading circumstances, but on opposite sides; and has to prove, that being murdered or starved in Germany, is by no means the same thing as being murdered or starved in America; and however difficult the task may appear, he acquits himself with dexterity: and the hearer, being governed by the impression of his eloquence, rather than by the weight of his reasoning, will give him the credit of having

succeeded in both causes. If his German friends are fallen on and half murdered, he represents them as the better for it. Like an oak, cut down, it gives occasion and makes room for young sprouts, which shoot with vigour, and increase in number: the young are improved and benefitted by the fall of the old. But a mere puff destroys an American; the roots are torn up by the falling of the trunk; the place it occupied is made vacant, and there is no prospect of its being filled again. The young subsist by the old, and receive no collateral aid; consequently, if the tree withers, their nourishment is gone, and they die.

Divesting our author of the character of a pleader, I ask him, in what essential point the ancient Germans and modern American Indians differ from each other? I ask him, why he has described, and even exaggerated, the evils that exist in America, and concealed their very name when speaking of Germany? The Black Forest might have been paradise; in describing its inhabitants, not a word is said of vice and misery; and only once, war is mentioned, in an incidental way: death might never have interrupted their peace, or disturbed their happiness or order. But America is represented as a place of skulls; misery is a

guest even at their pastimes; they know of no respite from sorrow and sufferings. One country is described as in the highest manner friendly to the increase of its inhabitants; the other, as the very seat of misery and woe.

From such decisions, I appeal, and refer both causes to a man of a sober, unbiassed mind, who, I conceive, would argue thus: The climate of America is liable to great extremes of heat and cold, but is on the whole, friendly to vegetation, and is superior in this respect to Germany; which, at the time of which we speak, was considerably colder and more inclement than now, and much more so than many parts of America. Virgil, speaking of the countries on the banks of the Danube, says,

> "Sic jacet ageribus niveis informis, et alto
> "Terra gelu late, septemque assurgit in ulnas
> "Semper hyems semper spirantes frigora cauri."

Of the soil and natural productions of the trans-atlantic continent there is a decided preference to be given. Indian corn and potatoes are indigenous in that quarter of the globe, and afforded an easy and abundant crop; but were unknown, and would not have lived, in Germany. In their place sprung up moss, which satisfied the hunger of the rein deer, an animal

which delights only in the most inclement regions of the earth.

The wars of the Americans were not more bloody, nor more frequent, than those of the Germans.---The Americans were less exposed to famine, because they relied less on agriculture for their subsistence; the produce of which was in danger of being wrested from them in war. ---Pestilence and common diseases were, it is probable, equally frequent and destructive in both places: and their domestic manners were so much alike as to have a similar influence on population and on happiness.

From such statements, a candid reader would be disposed to say, that the advantage was not great on either side, but preponderated towards the American.

Believing, as I do, that this is a just opinion, it excites my astonishment that Mr. M. should attempt to derive such opposite conclusions from premises so similar.

OF THE

# CHECKS TO POPULATION

## *IN SIBERIA.*

IT was not my design to have noticed any other chapter that treats of ancient or rude nations, but at once to have gone on to a consideration of some of the modern states of Europe, but the observations of Mr. M. on the nature of the checks to population in this province of the Russian empire, are so singular and so unexpected, that I cannot pass them by in silence.

Mr. M. assures us, on the authority of M. Pallas, "that the soil of Siberia consists in general of a fine black mould, of so rich a nature, as not to require, or even to bear dressing. Buck wheat, which is a common culture, is sown very thin, yet one sowing will last five or six years; and produce every year twelve or

fifteen times the original quantity. The seed which falls during the time of harvest is sufficient for the next year; and it is only necessary to pass a harrow once over it in the spring."*

Here, then, is the very country in which to exemplify Mr. M's. theory, and to show at what rate the human race are capable of increasing. Corn is in the greatest abundance, inviting its consumption; consequently, marriages are early and children numerous. No! says Mr. M., this is not the country in which to exemplify my principles. "The fertility of the soil is counterbalanced (by what?) by the little demand for manual labour." This remark I was not prepared to expect, and I call the attention of the reader particularly to it; for in countries, the soil of which is poor and unproductive, Mr. M. never once mentions manual labour as the means of overcoming that evil; but calls loudly for some messenger of death to take off part of the population.

I agree with Mr. M. that labour is a duty of indispensible obligation, as it is the mean of subsistence, but not the procuring cause of a full population. An individual, independent of

* Page 120.

manual labour, is not on that account deprived of the prospect of a family; and what is true of one, is applicable to a community. But mere drudgery is not the whole of labour; when the means of subsistence are secured, works of ingenuity and taste call for and engage the attention.---But, on the supposition that these are despised and neglected, and the inhabitants sink almost to the level of mere animals, their food growing round them, requiring only to be consumed, which is the state Mr. M. describes the Siberians to be in, would this prevent their increase? Yes! says Mr. M.; such countries seem to be under that moral impossibility of increasing which is well described by Sir James Steward; when he says, "Man, though he may often be produced without a sufficient demand for him, cannot readily multiply and prosper unless his labour be wanted; and the reason that population goes on so slowly in these countries is, that there is very little demand for men."*

Thus it seems, that population cannot increase where labour is necessary to the production of a good crop, nor where it is not.--- Mr. M. might have suspected the justness of his

*Page 118.

principles from the contradiction they imply.—But our author goes on to say, "If, from observing the deficiency of population compared with the fertility of the soil, we were to endeavour to remedy it, by giving a bounty on children, and thus enabling the labourer to rear up a greater number, what would be the consequence? Nobody would want the work of these supernumerary labourers that were thus brought into the market. Though the ample subsistence of a man for a day might be purchased for a penny, yet nobody will give these people a farthing for their labour. (Consequently) they are as completely without the means of subsistence as if they were living upon a barren sand, and must either emigrate to some place where their work is wanted, or perish miserably of poverty."*

I remember, when a boy, to have thought the punishment of Tantalus remarkably grievous, but I was not prepared to cast my eyes to a corner of this earth to behold its execution. Water continually flowing just below lips parched with thirst, of which they were not suffered to taste; the cravings of hunger, aggravated by

* Page 120.

the sight of the most agreeable food, never to be enjoyed, are sufferings the ancients presented to the imagination; but Mr. M. has discovered their reality, and given to a fiction the importance of truth.

The unfortunate individual who is doomed to spend the remainder of his days in Siberia, receives the sentence as a punishment; he goes as a criminal to reside among criminals; but still he expects to be under the laws of heaven. If he can command land, he expects by his industry to command bread: it would never occur to him that corn was already in such abundance that nobody would eat it, or only a few privileged individuals; and because the want of him had not previously been felt, therefore he must perish of poverty. Such, however, is the opinion Mr. M. advances. But a fertile soil, as a check to population, does not come under the heads either of vice, misery, or moral restraint: In another edition of his work, Mr. M. will, doubtless, give it its proper place.

A little further on in this chapter we are informed, that population can never increase with great rapidity but where the price of labour is very high, as in America.* If this be true,

* Page 125.

what becomes of Mr. M's. long chapter on the checks to population among the ancient inhabitants of the north of Europe, among whom labour was never paid for at all, and by whom servants were no more wanted than in Siberia, but who are represented as increasing as fast as the inhabitants of the United States?

Again, if a soil which yields an abundant crop with little of the labour of the husbandman be a check to population, what becomes of Mr. M's. second proposition? "That population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increase, unless prevented by some very powerful and obvious checks." An increase of subsistence is not a powerful or an obvious check. In Siberia hired labourers may not be wanted, but the man must be despised who cannot borrow as much seed as he wants: forty pounds of flour are sold for five farthings; and he can subsist till harvest on the waste of a family that can purchase an ox for five shillings.*

But if husbandry be unpleasant, or labour in this way unnecessary, Siberia is celebrated for the richness of the furs of the animals that are bred in its woods; which holds out an induce-

*Page 122.

ment to labour, at once pleasant and profitable: the man who can kill a fox may purchase flour.

When North America was colonised, and for many successive generations, when the distinction of master and servant was not much better attended to than in Siberia, neither the richness of the soil, nor the abundance of game, nor the little demand for labourers, checked the increase of population. What would have been thought of the man, who, in the early days of America, went there under an expectation of being hired as a servant, but nobody wanting his services, he was offered land to cultivate for himself, which he refused? Would not such a man have been thought insane? But, from Mr. M's. account, of such a description are a large proportion of the Siberians. The horn of plenty is emptied into their laps, but they will not accept of its contents, because it has not cost them labour in procuring.

But Mr. M. is yet at a loss fully to account for the slow increase of the population of Siberia. It is a country in which neither the armies of contending empires, nor bands of robbers, nor natives, dispossessed of their property, and thirsting for revenge, interrupt its tranquillity. It is a land of peace, and of fruitfulness: a land which

pestilence spares, and is freest of all others from those evils that are destructive to life: a land in which luxury and want are both unknown. But Mr. M., determined to find some cause of misery, seeks it among their blessings.----After dwelling on the difficulties that are in the way of an increase of people from the want of labour, our author suddenly turns round, forgets his theory, and, as his custom is, describes the actual state of the country. He says, the well-directed efforts of the late Empress, added to what had been done by Peter the 1st, had, as might be expected, a considerable effect, (in increasing the population of Russia). Though the population of the more fertile provinces of Siberia be still very inadequate to the richness of the soil, yet in some of them agriculture flourishes in no inconsiderable degree, and great quantities of corn are grown. In the general dearth, which happened in 1769, the province of Isitsk was able, notwithstanding a scanty harvest, to supply, in the usual manner, the founderies and forges of Ural, besides preserving from the horrors of famine all the neighbouring provinces.---The time at which this happened cannot have been far remote, if it was not at the precise instant, of which Mr. M. speaks, when men, it is said,

could not exist because they could not be employed. I leave the reader to make his own comments.

Before our author concludes his chapter on Siberia, as his great and leading checks to population do not apply to the state of that country, he wholly unloads his quiver of the lesser. Some places are too dry, others are too wet and marshy; some places are even too full of inhabitants; in another a disease among the horned cattle is ranked among the checks to population. "In the flourishing colony of the Moravian brethren at Serepta, it is said, that the young people cannot marry without the consent of their priests, and that their consent is not in general granted till late. It would appear, therefore, that among the obstacles to the increase of population, even in these new colonies, the preventive check has its share."*

The influence such checks have on the population of a country it is useless to enquire into. In a large province there will be a variety in the soil, and in the most healthful region of the globe there are tracks of country that do not merit this character. But that a disease among

*Page 125.

horned cattle has an influence on population I am not prepared to admit. As to the Moravian brethren, I understand it is usual for the priests, or some other officers in their church, to appoint the wives of their young men, in every country where they have a settlement, but it is not considered as a check to population.

OF THE

# CHECKS TO POPULATION

## *IN NORWAY.*

THE chapter which treats of the population of Norway, is entitled to particular attention; because in it our author has detailed his sentiments in a clear and intelligible manner, incapable of being misunderstood; but especially because it contains a statement on which depends many of the inferences and conclusions in the subsequent chapters, the whole of which I shall attempt to prove erroneous.

Mr. Malthus remarks, "that Norway, during nearly the whole of the last century, was in a peculiar degree exempt from the drains of people by war. The climate," he goes on to say, "is remarkably free from epidemic sicknesses; and, in common years, the mortality is less than in any other country in Europe, the registers of

which are known to be correct.---Yet the population of Norway never seems to have increased with great rapidity.---And we," continues our author, "feel assured, that, as the positive checks to its population have been so small, the preventive check must have been proportionably great."*

This view of the subject, Mr. M. conceives he has fully established, by proving, that the average term of life is greater in Norway, and that the marriages are fewer, in proportion to the population, than appears in the registers of any other nation, except Switzerland. From this clear and explicit statement, we are led at once to the conclusion, that the infrequency of marriages is the only cause of the very slow increase of population in Norway. Confident of the truth of this opinion, Mr. M. enters upon the proof of it. The first bar in the way of marriage, is the authority of the military officers and priests over the common soldiers; no one of whom can marry without having obtained their permission.†---

This is certainly a very considerable hardship on the individuals, but as a check to population

* Page 184. † Page 185.

it is insignificant. The Norwegian soldiers are not very numerous; and it is of little consequence to the population of any state, whether the soldiers are married or not, for few children are born in camps, and the regiment may be deemed prolific that rears its own drummers.

Unless, therefore, Mr. M. be prepared to prove that a larger standing army is kept up in Norway than in other states, in proportion to its population, this check is not entitled to further consideration.

The next preventive to marriage, noticed by Mr. M., is the want of manufacturing towns to take off the overflowing population of the country.* Our author might have recollected, that manufacturing towns are never established in states as little civilized as Norway. There are no manufacturing towns in Tartary, nor are any wanted: the population of such countries do not require such drains.

Mr. Malthus next passes on to the management of the land, and in it he discovers another powerful preventive to marriage. It appears, that on every farm in Norway there are a number of cottage houses, in which part of the ser-

* Page 186.

vants live, others are boarded with the farmer: to each of these cottages is attached sufficient land to keep from one to six cows, which is considered in part as a compensation for service. These cottagers are called housemen, and from the nature of their engagement it is requisite they should be married.---Having tenanted these houses, Mr. M. cannot discover any other means by which a wife and family can be maintained, except in the vicinity of the towns or on the sea-coast; the vacancy of "a place of this kind (a houseman's place, he expressly declares) is the only prospect which presents itself of keeping a family."*

It is the custom in Scotland, and I believe has been so in every country in Europe, before money, as a medium of exchange, became well understood and in abundance, for farmers to pay their servants in part from the produce of the land: a load of meal, the keep of a cow or two, a house, and the carriage of fuel, are very common stipulations even at this day in the northern parts of this kingdom. But those who are not thus paid are recompensed in a different but an equal manner.---If to obtain a houseman's

*Page 186.

place was to gain a fortune, it would then be an object of strife, and every young man would marry, and submit to much temporary inconvenience, under the hope of some time obtaining such a situation. It does not, however, appear that the housemen are better remunerated than the other servants. But are there no cottages in Norway but those attached to farms? and would it be impossible for a married man to obtain a house by paying a rent, and to subsist by his wages, as in England? Are there no forests or mines in Norway, by labouring in which a competency for a man and his family might be obtained? Certainly there are. On this view of the subject it does not therefore appear that the hinderances to the marriage of a Norwegian peasant are so great and insurmountable as Mr. M. represents them to be.

Our author next informs his readers, that in every gentleman's family there are a much greater proportion of servants than the work seems to require.* Industry is an acquirement which it is exceedingly probable the Norwegian peasants have not yet attained.

The next remark of our author's respects the

* Page 187.

markets, in which not even a pound of butter can at all times be purchased. This, however, is not a check to population but a mark of barbarism; markets are only established and regularly supplied when population has made considerable progress.

After passing some compliments on the prudence of the peasants in not marrying lest the country should be over-peopled, our author goes on to speak of the nature of the soil. Here it is unnecessary to follow him, for whether the land be good or bad, it is the concurring testimony of all travellers, that the Norwegian peasant lives in the full enjoyment of the common necessaries of life.

Such are the various circumstances mentioned by Mr. M., as influencing, or rather compelling, a greater number of peasants to live unmarried in Norway than elsewhere. Comparing them with the hinderances in the way of an English peasant, they appear inadequate to this end. But Mr. M. attempts to prove their truth in another way, to which great attention is requisite, for it is a main pillar in our author's theory. The annual marriages in Norway, he finds, are not in a greater proportion than 1 to 130 of the inhabitants; from hence it is concluded that

they are contracted by persons advanced in life, and that consequently the preventive check has great force. It is very easy for a theorist to deceive himself; Mr. M., in his calculation, has entirely overlooked the age to which the people of Norway live, and has mistaken the proof of a long life for a late marriage. To place this in a clear light, I shall mention the age attained, and the proportion the annual marriages bear to the population in the following countries:

| | *Age.* | *Annual Marriages.* |
|---|---|---|
| Norway, | 48, | 1 in 130 persons. |
| England, | 40, | 123 |
| Sweden, | $34\frac{1}{2}$, | 112 |
| Switzerland, | 45, | 140 |
| 22 Dutch Villages, according to Susmilch, | 23, | 64 |

In France the registers are not correct; but Mr. M. says, both the mortality and tendency to marriage are much greater than in Switzerland.

If the registers of the above countries may be relied on, they show a very considerable relation between the healthfulness of a place and the proportion of marriages in it; Switzerland is somewhat of an exception, but it ought to be remembered that the emigration of males is greater from that country than from any of the others.

To confine the subject to as small a compass as possible, let us suppose five marriages to have been contracted between ten persons all at the age of twenty, and that these marriages yielded ten children, but the parents died when the children were young; if they intermarry, there will still be only five marriages and ten persons. The inferences to be drawn from these facts are, that the parents were short-lived, and that the number of marriages were very great in proportion to the population, but there is no proof of the ages the parties were of at the time their marriages were contracted.

Again,---Suppose five other marriages yielded the same number of children, whose parents lived to see them married; in this case there would be five marriages and twenty persons; ten parents and ten children. The facts proved are, that the parents lived to a good age, and that the number of marriages to the population was much fewer than in the other case; but it does not prove which marriages were contracted latest in life.

Let us apply these observations to a nation: if the people are healthy and live long, at every marriage that is contracted, the old married persons being enumerated, make the number of

annual marriages appear very small; were these omitted, the proportion of marriages would rise. In order to show, by this mode of reasoning, that marriages are contracted later in life in one country than in another, Mr. M. ought to have reduced the term of life to the same standard in both places, and then have shown his facts: the people who live to 48 years will certainly possess more existing marriages than those who live only to 23. The youths of a marriageable age in Switzerland, and those in Holland, it is probable, are equally inclined to marriage.

The problem on which Mr. M's. reasoning turns, is this, if the parents be living at the time of the marriages of their children, will the proportion of marriages, to the individuals composing that family, be greater than if the parents were dead? In this form the problem is of easy solution. After attentively considering the subject, I cannot discover that the facts brought forward by Mr. M. admit of any other.

At Augsburg, in 1510, the proportion of marriages to the population was as 1 to 86; in 1750, as 1 to 123. In Dantzic, in the year 1705, the proportion was as 1 to 89; in 1745, as 1 to 118. Many other places show similar results; and from them, Mr. M. argues, that

marriages were contracted at a more advanced age in the later than in the earlier periods. But the fact is, that in every place alluded to, there has been an improvement in longevity sufficient to account for the difference in the proportion of the marriages. The marriageable age is nearly the same in every country in Europe: it would be cruelty, both to the parents and children, to lay such restrictions in the way of marriage that the death of the parents could alone remove them; and this is Mr. M's. idea. It is not agreeable to the nature of man that this should be the case; and any less restriction, it is probable, would be broken through.

If celibacy be a check to the population of Norway, so it is to other countries, and it is only by comparison that its influence can be judged of. Celibacy is felt in Norway with very little more force than in England; but in England many other, and much more powerful, means of lessening population prevail. The check of celibacy presses with nearly equal force in both countries; but population increases in England and does not in Norway, consequently the opinion Mr. M. advances, respecting that country, is erroneous.

OF THE

# CHECKS TO POPULATION

## *IN SWITZERLAND.*

ABOUT forty years ago the evidently declining state of the population of Switzerland excited the attention, and alarmed the fears of that people. On this occasion several memoirs were presented to the economic society at Berne, acknowledging the fact, and proposing to remedy it by calling in new settlers, by giving dowries to young women, by preventing emigration, and by aiding the beneficial operation of these plans by other regulations of an inferior nature.--- Mons. Muret, minister of Vivey, greatly to his credit, attended, with much perseverance and care, to the subject, with the design of ascertaining the extent of the evil complained of; and as the registers in Switzerland had been kept from their establishment, a period of 210 years, he had ample means of information before him.

Seventeen parishes, which do not appear to have been under any circumstances peculiar to themselves, are particularly noticed; and after dividing the registers into three parts, of 70 years each, M. Muret next ascertained the sum of births in each period; the first of which ended in 1620, the second in 1690, and the third in 1760. In the first term the sum of the births was 49860, or 712 annually; in the last, only 43910, which would be only 626 annually. From these and similar facts M. Muret coincided in the general opinion, that the population had decreased and was decreasing; and the view of the subject he then took, went some way in pointing out the rate at which the declension had been made. But Mr. Malthus says, that Mons. Muret, and the people of Switzerland, were all deceived, and had mistaken a rapid increase for a gradual decline. He argues thus: During the first, and to near the end of the second period, the country was visited by frequent returns of epidemic and sickly seasons; but in the last 90 years, the people enjoyed better health. In the sickly period of 120 years he supposes the annual mortality to have been 1 in 26: in the healthy period he supposes it to have risen to 1 in 36. In the first period

there were 720 children born annually; and as their lives could only be computed at 26 years, by multiplying the births, 712 by 26, the probable number of years they would live, it makes the number of inhabitants 18512. In the healthy period there were only 626 annual births, but the lives of the Swiss at that time being supposed on an average ten years longer than those of the former period, indicate a population of 22536, that is, 626 multiplied by 36 give that number.

By these calculations, which certainly are extremely plausible, Mr. M. conceives he has overthrown the accurate investigation of Mons. Muret, and the common opinion of the inhabitants of Switzerland; but it does not unfrequently happen that the most specious conjectures are fallacious. It is scarcely possible a people should increase from 18 to 22000 and not to be conscious of it: the old inhabitants must have witnessed the building of houses, the inclosing of waste lands, the general increase of accommodations over the country, the extension of manufactories; and what they had seen they would speak of; but the very reverse was their testimony: they lamented the decay of towns and villages, the declension of the arts, the lan-

guid state of agriculture and commerce, the frequency of emigration; in short, the face of the country indicated a declining population.

A very superficial acquaintance with the present and former state of Europe, conveys an idea that its population hath in the last centuries increased; and by those political arithmeticians who have paid attention to the subject, it has been ascertained that it has even doubled in the last 500 years: but on the calculation of Mr. M. the population of Switzerland has gone on at a more rapid rate, which the people, neither by investigation nor by the general appearance of the country, could discover.

Were there no other facts than these on which to form a judgment, I should not hesitate to conclude that Mr. Malthus had fallen into an error. But M. Muret, by additional evidence, places this matter beyond all doubt. He informs us, in the town of Berne, from the year 1583 to 1654, the sovereign council admitted into the Bourgeoisie 487 families, of which 379 became extinct in the space of two centuries; in 1783 only 108 of them remained. During the hundred years, from 1684 to 1784, 207 Bourgeoisie families became extinct. From 1624 to 1712, the Bourgeoisie was given to 80 families. In

1623, the sovereign council united the members of 112 families, of which 58 only remain.*

Such facts are conclusive, as far as relates to the town of Berne; and as it is not large, or the occupation of its inhabitants unhealthy, it is fair to suppose other towns, and even the country at large, partook of the like declension: many of the families mentioned, doubtless became extinct, in the proper sense of the term; others might emigrate, and in this way be accounted dead by the government; but in either case, the idea of an increasing population does not present itself.

It may not be improper here to enquire into the consistency of the reasoning in this, compared with the foregoing chapter, and with the general tendency and spirit of the work. Population, Mr. M. considers, as every where oppressed and kept down by some violent cause, especially the want of a suitable situation in which to obtain the means of subsistence for a family; but as often as a plague, or some other affliction, makes room for the full power of increase, population rebounds to its former level, like a bow which had been bent. A sickly climate is de-

* Page 278.

clared to be the greatest promoter of marriage, and the most certain pledge of a numerous progeny. "We know, (says our author) from the registers of other countries, which have been already noticed, and more particularly from that of Prussia, that the period of the greatest mortality naturally produces a greater number of births." And in corroboration of this remark, we are told, that in twenty-two Dutch villages, marriages and births succeeded each other in the most rapid succession, because the country is unhealthy.* But in Switzerland, which was also unhealthy, having been wasted by one plague after another for upwards of a century, the number of births were not at any time increased beyond former years; the period of the greatest mortality did not there naturally produce a greater number of births, but, on the contrary, from the very termination of the sickly seasons, a gradual declension was observed. Thus, neither health nor sickness removed from Switzerland the weight which was sinking its population.

But, for the sake of placing the subject under as many points of view as possible, let it be granted to Mr. M. that his opinion of the state

* Page 242.

of the population of that country is correct; and that for several generations the inhabitants had increased at the rate of doubling themselves in two or three hundred years. This is still a very slow rate compared with that of the American states; and Mr. M. has yet to assign a reason, why the population of Switzerland, for short periods, when the country was healthy, and the government, by its maxims and policy, promoted the population of the state, did not increase at least as rapidly as the American colonies. This objection to his reasoning Mr. M. appears to have overlooked, or very slightly attended to: he has not summoned to his aid, during the healthy seasons, a host of evils, and encamped them in the vallies of Switzerland! The effects of vice and misery, in the last ninety years of which Mr. M. speaks, were not greater than in America; some other check must therefore be sought for, and our author thinks he has discovered it in the strong attachment of the Swiss to a life of celibacy, by which he gives up all his former opinions on this subject. We are not now told that new marriages are contracted immediately on the dissolution of old ones, but that the proportion of unmarried persons in Berne, including widows and widowers,

is considerably above the half of the adults; and the proportion of those below sixteen to those above, is nearly as 1 to 3.*

It is a remarkable circumstance, that above half the adults in a town should be unmarried; the men might be mohawks, who are described to be without sexual appetite; their passions might be in unison with the frozen regions of the arctic circles, and their sympathies with those timid animals that are frightened at their own resemblance, and who never fancy themselves safe but when in solitude---they eat their morsels alone, and call it happiness.

But before censuring the bachelors of Berne, it is fair to enquire into the truth of the charge against them. As it now stands, the fact is a most striking one. But at what age does Mr. M. consider the people of Berne as adult? Is it at sixteen? If so, the remark loses its force; for other cities have as many unmarried inhabitants above that age.---I must here beg leave to draw the attention of the reader to this subject. Mr. M. speaks of the marriageable age in Switzerland in such a manner as to convey an idea of its being the same as in England; but in the

* Page 277.

next page he proves that this is not the case. The population of the Pays de Vaud, M. Muret estimates at 113000, (I here transcribe from Mr. M.), of which 76000 are adults; 76000 is rather more than two-thirds of 113000, there is of course only one-third of the population that have not arrived at this period; who these are Mr. M. has just informed us, they are the children beneath the age of sixteen, so that the adults are reckoned to be all above sixteen; and Mr. M. uses as synonymous the terms adult and marriageable.---I hope he has not often attempted to impose on his readers in this manner. It must have been known to him, when he spoke of the marriageable age in Switzerland, that it would not convey the idea of a lad of sixteen, and it was incumbent on him not to have misled the public.

Among the 76000 adults there are 19000 subsisting marriages, consequently 38000 married persons, or exactly the half. Besides these, there are 9000 widows and widowers.*

This estimate for the whole country does away with the impression the statement respecting the people of Berne was calculated to make.

* Page 277.

and there is still another circumstance which proves that celibacy was not more common in Switzerland than in other European states. In the neighbouring country of France, which Mr. M. represents as being as much disposed as the Swiss are averse to marriage, there were, according to M. Peuchet, 1451063 males, about the middle of the revolution; the account was published in 1800, in an essay, entitled, *Essai d'une Statitisque Generale.* At the same period, the author calculates, there were five millions of males in the whole, between the ages of 18 and 50*. If to the 1451063 males of the military age, be added the youths between 16 and 18, and the old men above 50; and if to this be also added the larger proportion of unmarried men who composed the armies of France, and who fell in the unprecedented conflict which continued to the middle of the revolution, the proportion of unmarried persons in France and Switzerland will be found nearly equal.

But I am unwilling to press this subject any further, for the statements of Mr. M. are so directly opposite to each other, that it is impossible to ascertain his sentiments. After writing seve-

* Page 287.

ral pages, and drawing inferences from the facts related, with a view to prove that the preventive check operated very forcibly in Switzerland, our author gallops away to the *Lac de Joux*, a few stages from Berne, where he forgets the preventive check, and enters into a discussion with his landlady on his doctrines of population. This good lady, who seems to have embraced the general principles advanced by Mr. M., is very far from charging the Swiss with apathy, on the contrary, she laments with much bitterness that boys and girls were marrying who ought to have been at school; and she told Mr. M., if this habit of early marriages continued, they should always be wretched, and distressed for subsistence.*

Dismissing this good lady, our author presently after meets with a labourer, who had a turn for politics, and to whom Mr. M. pays some handsome compliments; in his opinion, early marriages were *le vice du pays*; and that a law ought to be made, restraining men from entering into the marriage state before they were forty years of age, and then allowing it only with "*des vielles filles.*"†

* Page 281. † Pa. 282.

As these statements are wholly irreconcilable with what is said of the city of Berne, and as the chapter does not afford matter for any further observations, I pass on.

*Of the Effects of Epidemic Years on Population.*

IT is an axiom with Mr. Malthus, of universal application, that an epidemic disease, or any other calamity, that takes off at a stroke part of the population of a country, not only makes room for, but invites to, new marriages; and the number of unmarried youths of both sexes are represented as being in every country so great, that the remnant left by the most destructive plague, is sufficient to reoccupy every place made vacant, and their willingness to do so is so general, that in a very few years not a trace of the mischief inflicted can be found. So important is this circumstance to Mr. M's. doctrine, that he publishes a table from Susmilch to prove its truth. "The way," says our author, "in which these periods of mortality affect all the general proportions of births, deaths, and marriages, is strikingly illustrated in the table for Prussia and Lithuania, from the year 1692 to the year 1757."* As the table is interesting, I have copied it.

* Page 252.

| Annual average. | Marriages. | Births. | Deaths. | Proportion of births to marriages. | Proportion of deaths to births. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 yrs. to 1697 | 5747 | 19715 | 14862 | 10 : 34 | 100 : 132 |
| 5 yrs. -- 1702 | 6070 | 24112 | 14474 | 10 : 39 | 100 : 165 |
| 6 yrs. -- 1708 | 6082 | 26896 | 16430 | 10 : 44 | 100 : 163 |
| In 1709 and 1710 | a plague | Number destroyed in 2 years. | 247733 | | |
| In 1711 | 12028 | 32522 | 10131 | 10 : 27 | 100 : 320 |
| In 1712 | 6267 | 22970 | 10445 | 10 : 36 | 100 : 220 |
| 5 yrs. to 1716 | 4968 | 21603 | 11984 | 10 : 43 | 100 : 180 |
| 5 yrs. -- 1721 | 4324 | 21396 | 12039 | 10 : 49 | 100 : 177 |
| 5 yrs. -- 1726 | 4719 | 21452 | 12863 | 10 : 45 | 100 : 166 |
| 5 yrs. -- 1731 | 4808 | 29554 | 12825 | 10 : 42 | 100 : 160 |
| 4 yrs. -- 1735 | 5424 | 22692 | 15475 | 10 : 41 | 100 : 146 |
| In 1736 | 5280 | 21859 | 26371 | Epidemic years. | |
| In 1737 | 5765 | 18930 | 24480 | | |
| 5 yrs. to 1742 | 5582 | 22099 | 15255 | 10 : 39 | 100 : 144 |
| 4 yrs. -- 1746 | 5469 | 25275 | 15117 | 10 : 46 | 100 : 167 |
| 5 yrs. -- 1751 | 6423 | 28235 | 17272 | 10 : 43 | 100 : 163 |
| 5 yrs. -- 1756 | 5599 | 28392 | 19154 | 10 : 50 | 100 : 148 |
| In the 16 yrs. before the plague. | 95585 | 380516 | 245763 | 10 : 39 | 100 : 154 |
| In 46 yrs. after the plague. | 248777 | 1083872 | 690324 | 10 : 43 | 100 : 157 |
| In 62 good years | 344361 | 1464388<br>936087 | 936087 | 10 : 43 | 100 : 156 |
| More born than died | | 528301 | | | |
| In the 2 plague years | 5477 | 23977 | 247733 | | |
| In all the 64 yrs including the plague | 340838 | 1488365<br>1183820 | 1183820 | 10 : 42 | 100 : 125 |
| More born than died | | 304745 | | | |

From this view of the effects of a plague, it is impossible not to consider it as the greatest blessing that can happen to a nation.---In the years 1711 and 1712, Susmilch calculates that one-third of the whole population were cut off, to the evident benefit of the survivors; but he has overlooked one circumstance: In epidemic fevers, children do not suffer more than adults, of course the havoc made in families must have been exceeding great. The ties of nature and affection, in a thousand instances, would have been rent asunder; every eye, big with tears, and every heart weighed down with anguish, would sufficiently testify the general affliction, and suspend for a time all plans of future happiness. But Mr. M. represents the Prussians as void of natural affection; as hard hearted. Neither of which characters belong to man. There is a mourning for the dead, really felt; which the Prussians must have violated, and with it the common decencies of life. The bonds of nature are no sooner broken, than the remembrance is lost, and the breach is healed; like bees, whose nest has been injured, the evil is forgotten in the endeavour to remedy it.---I think the Prussians will not thank Mr. Malthus for his character of them.

In the very year after the plague, the number of marriages were almost double those of any of the six preceding years; which Mr. M. accounts for very easily, on the principles already advanced. He supposes that almost all who were of a marriageable age, strongly excited by the demand for labour and the number of vacant employments, immediately entered into that state*. Truly, they lost no time; but this is not all in the very same year: the first after the plague, they not only married, but became parents. In the year preceding this calamity there were 26896 births, but in the year after, when the population was reduced one third, the births were increased to 32522. It is impossible to conceive of facts that more strongly illustrate our author's theory; but is there no error in the registers? have not the births of the two plague years been added to those which immediately followed them? There is ground to suspect this has been the case; for in the succeeding year, the second after the plague, the births were only 22970. And in the subsequent plague, which happened in 1736 and 1737, which was indeed not severe, but sufficiently so to show the

* Page 254.

operation of the principle, the number of marriages appear not to have been affected, and the number of births were lessened.

Taking the subject as Mr. M. represents it, it is impossible a permanent loss in population should be sustained. Cut off a third of the people at a stroke, and on this plan you render the surviving two thirds a kindness: they are so relieved from the influence of vice, misery, and moral restraint, and live in so much ease, surrounded by plenty, that they bring up as many children as the whole could have done.

But here the benefit of the plague ceases; these young persons, when grown to maturity, being as numerous as those before the plague, are consequently subjected to similar evils; and to enjoy the same blessings as their parents, another plague must sweep off one third of them; for the instant the places made vacant are again occupied, the struggle begins between vice, misery, and moral restraint, and the principle of increase; and must go on, till war or pestilence once more thin the land, and bring back peace, happiness and plenty. On this view of the subject, the arm of the assassin is lifted in benevolence,---war is humanity,---and pestilence a blessing.

The picture Mr. Malthus has drawn of the government of the world, and the state of man, cannot be contemplated without horror! Death, surrounded by a legion of common diseases, is insufficient for his office; and the world, over which his influence extends, cannot enjoy tranquillity, unless an unnatural aid be given this common enemy, and man becomes the murderer of himself! Death dispatches his messengers, and thousands fall, but their fall is gentle, being prepared to expect it. But the guests at nature's table, finding the deed of death only half performed, come forward, and seizing on the weakest of their brethren, thrust them into the sepulchre, and close its mouth: death had no warrant against them. But, apprehending a scarcity of subsistence, the guests judged it better that a part should suffer, rather than the whole should live in an unceasing conflict with misery, confusion, and vice.---Thus the servant usurps the place of his Master: and thus Mr. M. represents the government of the world we live in.

In the opinion formed by our author, of the great utility and general good of epidemic diseases, have not their natural and common effects been overlooked? and has not his opinion been

formed on the imperfect statement of registers? A loss may be proved by them to have been soon recovered; but whether by actual increase, or by emigrants, they afford no evidence.

That this subject, about which Mr. Malthus has written so much, and is so desirous of establishing, may be stript of all the blandishments of sophistry, and the aid of false documents, let us examine the natural consequences of an epidemic disease on the population of a town, from which emigrants are excluded:---Suppose the town to contain 20000 inhabitants, 2000 of whom are suddenly removed by death; in such a town there may be conjectured to be 20 grocers, 20 drapers, 10 attornies, 10 surgeons, and, if it be not a cathedral town, 10 clergymen, of all denominations. This proportion I mention, not as absolutely correct, but as an approximation to the truth.---If 2000 out of the 20000 be cut off, 2 grocers, 2 drapers, 1 attorney, 1 surgeon, and 1 clergyman will form a part, and the whole be completed from other classes of the community. Those who escape from the malady will bear the same proportion to each other that the whole did. The loss of two grocers, and their customers, presents no inducement to two young men to marry, that they may

occupy their places; the shops, indeed, may be obtained, but the customers are dead; and those that could be attracted by them, would be those that properly belonged to the 18 previously established. If the town presented another situation for a grocer, it was before the plague, for 20 can divide better than a less number. Houses made empty by a general calamity, do not promise a prosperous trade to those who shall next inhabit them; but, on the contrary, their occupation, before the town was replenished with inhabitants, would tend to impoverish every individual in the same line of business; and thus retard, rather than promote, marriages.

If we assent to the statement of Mr. M., that in every town there are a number of young persons, of a marriageable age, waiting with impatience the death of others, that they may find suitable situations for the support of families; they would be greatly disappointed, if they imagined a plague, or any other severe calamity, opened to them such situations.

Suppose, after 2000 were cut off, that as many instantly married, to supply their places, there are still no more than 18000 persons in the whole, and each new married pair must be sub-

ject to more difficulties in procuring a situation now, than before the plague.

Were the 18 surviving grocers, under an idea of excluding competitors, to purchase the stocks of the deceased, they evidently would not increase the consumption of the articles purchased; the town would be to them as if nothing had happened; and before they can have the increase of a single customer, children must be born and grow up. And when this young generation are about to take their stations in the world, the time which had elapsed since the decrease in population took place, would have so new-modelled the state of society, that the town would be as unprepared for their reception as if the population had never exceeded 18000.

Venice and Antwerp once flourised in all the pride of commerce, and in all the splendour of eastern magnificence, but they have fallen into decay, and lost many of their inhabitants; no matter from what cause, they are gone; and should a like number now endeavour to occupy their places, the old houses would cost as much to repair, as building of new ones; and trade would with as much difficulty be gained, as if Antwerp and Venice had never been celebrated for their commerce.

The loss of a part does not benefit the survivors, or present new stations for the support of families. I will venture to say, that long before the children, born after the calamity we have been speaking of, were grown to maturity, and increased the population of any town to its former standard, the old inhabitants would not only be reconciled to their half empty streets, but be pleased with them, and fancy themselves great and dignified, because they were without competitors. Like birds of ill omen, they would prefer a house in ruins to its being inhabited by those who might disturb their repose: the silence of desolation is to them preferable to the din of men: They would say to all strangers, Begone! we do not require your service, and will not be interrupted by your insolence. The stranger, by importunity, might work a little on their compassion, and they might say, in the language of mildness, if you occupy one of these houses you must starve, we can with difficulty support ourselves; the population is quite equal to the means of subsistence, and if we assist you we injure others.

A young married couple, seeking to obtain a living by industry, have a much better prospect of success at London than at York; at Man-

chester than at Norwich. York and Norwich are in the situation of towns that have lost part of their population, and are the very places Mr. Malthus would point out, as inviting to an increase of marriages, and ensuring an increase of births. Houses may be obtained, and there are vacant stations in which families have been supported, but this is, in fact, of little consideration; the habits of the people determine the eligibility of the place. London and Manchester are increasing in inhabitants, whose industry is a pledge of abundance. An active people are never too numerous; but indolence has never room enough.

From the above remarks, it does not appear that the places made empty by pestilence are beneficial to a town; nor is it, in the nature of things, that they should be at once reoccupied, if emigrants be excluded. Pestilence does not, like a gardener, pluck up the injurious and offensive, that the useful plants may dart their tendrils, and fill up their places; but, like a blast, it indiscriminately withers all over which it passes; and none, even at a distance, are benefited.

A sickly population is not more a token of early marriages, contracted because places were

made vacant by the death of others, than a blighted plant promises an abundant crop.

It has sometimes happened, that a plague, breaking out on the continent, has swept off one third of the population; but in England it has seldom taken off more than one fifth. Between the years 1582 and 1682, there were five great plagues in England; one in the year 1592, 1603, 1625, 1636, and 1666, (Sir Wm. Petty, Polit. Arith. p. 39.)---Thus we find, that about every 20 years a plague destroyed about a fifth of the population.---In the same period of which we are speaking, there were ten years of civil wars, the like of which, Sir W. Petty observes, there hath not been of several ages before, which took away one fortieth of the whole population. Polit. Arith. p. 49.

I mention this circumstance, because it marks the extent of the check by war. If we strike off the whole number of persons lost to the state by these means, and then enquire why the survivors did not increase at least as fast as the American colonists, we shall again find that Mr. Malthus's theory is not supported by the facts he imagines.

If it be allowed that the Americans suffered neither from war or pestilence during the period

of their most rapid increase, we shall be justified in supposing that the other checks to population operated in as great force as in England. In other terms, if we take the whole of the population of America, at the period we are speaking of, and that part of the population of England which war and pestilence had spared, we place them on an equal footing, and are entitled to expect that their increase will be equal. But in the space of 100 years, during which the American population doubled itself four times, in a geometrical ratio, and increased from one to eight, the English did not increase more than from one to one and a quarter.

Sir W. Petty states, that, during the period of which he had been speaking, the rate of doubling, for the whole of England, was once in 369 years, (p. 59.) But there is no apparent reason why the surviving four fifths, or three fourths, did not double themselves, or nearly so, in the intermediate space. If the population, before the plague, was 100000, after the plague it would be 80000; which, in 20 years, should have increased to 140000;---these again reduced one fifth, leaves 110000; which, in 20 years more, should have been nearly 200000. Thus, it appears, notwithstanding the devastation by

pestilence and war, the population of England ought to have doubled itself in about 60 years.

Dismissing this branch of the subject, let us attend to one of still more importance to our author's theory, and to which he alludes in almost every page; and of which, when he speaks in direct terms, his language is so positive, that, without doubt, he thinks himself unanswerable. That I may not misrepresent his ideas, I shall give his words.

"In Norway, the mortality is 1 in 48, and the marriages 1 in 130. In the Dutch villages, the mortality 1 in 23, and the marriages 1 in 64. The difference both in the marriages and deaths is above double. They maintain their relative proportions in a very exact manner, and show how much the deaths and marriages mutually depend upon each other, and that, except where some sudden start in the agriculture of a country enlarges the means of subsistence, an increase of marriages will only produce an increase of mortality, and *vice versa*."*

This sentiment not only accords with Mr. M's. general theory, but, as has already been said, is the very soul of it. Misery is his polar star.

* Page 243.

It leads him to happiness. And unless it broods over a country, nothing is desirable in it. An end must be put to the life of one person, to increase the felicity of another. The more deaths, the more marriages; the more marriages, the more deaths,---is our author's unceasing strain. Misery leads the way. Misery governs the world.

But how does he prove the truth of these remarks? He proves it thus: In Norway, the life of a man is worth 48 years; and 1 marriage is contracted annually in 130 persons: but in Holland, where life is only worth 23 years, 1 marriage is contracted in 64 persons: consequently, there is a dependence of the marriages on the deaths; the latter must take place, to make way for the former.

To show the fallacy of these inferences, let us take another view of the subject. Two persons in every 130 annually marry, and live, on an average of the whole population of the country, to 48 years; consequently, 48 marriages will be formed in the lifetime of one person; or, in 48 years, 96 persons in 130 will marry; which reduces the unmarried to 34.---In the Dutch villages, every 32nd person is married annually, and every 23rd dies: in other terms,

one third only, as in Norway, die unmarried. A proportion, by far too small, to render the circumstance even probable; for, a larger than this proportion of the born, die before they arrive at the marriageable age, in the most healthy district in Europe.

To this objection, all Mr. Malthus's laboured calculations are liable, which completely overturns his reasoning. The thing itself being impossible, the premises of course are erroneous.---But, suppose his statements true, what do they prove? Do they prove, that more adults die unmarried in Norway than in Holland? Certainly not. Then the obstacles in the way of marriage cannot be greater. Had there been a greater proportion of marriages to the population in one country than the other, the relation between the mortality and the marriages could not have been so nicely maintained.

Suppose, in Norway, one third of the born live to marry, the mortality being 1 in 48, of 130 persons 43 would at some period of their lives marry. Suppose, in Holland, more than one third of the born live to marry, say two thirds, it would then appear, that, the mortality being 1 in 23, of 64 persons 42 would marry.---Could Mr. M. prove the truth of a statement

similar to this, he would, in some measure, establish the doctrine he advances. But, in saying that there is an agreement between the deaths and marriages, corresponding in different countries, he proves nothing that he wishes to prove. A marriage implies two persons, consequently, if there be in a town 50 annual marriages, and 150 annual births, 50 of the born die unmarried. But can it, from this statement, be ascertained that they do not die in infancy. According to Mr. M., in Norway, only 34 of every 130 of the born, die unmarried; and in Holland, only 36 of 128.

By such statements, he shows a remarkable equality in the proportion of marriages; a remarkable similarity in the number of those who die in childhood, and in celibacy; which is the reverse of what he designed.

OF THE

# CHECKS TO POPULATION

*In various Countries.*

BESIDES the chapters I have noticed, Mr. Malthus's work contains many others, none of which have any thing either sufficiently striking or novel to recommend them to particular attention; I shall therefore pass them hastily over.

The first chapter treats of the checks to population in the lowest stage of human society; particularizing the natives of Terra del Fuego, of Van Diemen's land, of the islands of Andaman, and of New Holland; and to the lovers of the marvellous, it affords a rich feast.---Among other strange stories, we are told, that the people of New Holland are so pinched with want, that "they are compelled to climb the tallest trees after honey, and the smaller animals, such as the flying squirrel and the opossum.

When the stems are of great height, and without branches, which is generally the case, in thick forests, this is a process of great labour, and is effected by cutting a notch with their stone hatchets for each foot successively, while their left arm embraces the tree. Trees were observed notched in this manner to the height of eighty feet before the first branch, where the hungry savage could hope to meet with any reward for so much toil."*

Can Mr. M. credit such tales. Is not a tree of eighty feet without a branch too large to be clasped with one arm, while the hungry Hollander cuts notches with the other? Are not all savages disinclined to such severe labour; and are they not too cunning to be made dupes of? The flying squirrel, in all probability, reached the branches by jumping from another tree, and might very easily jump back again: but suppose this was not the case, who could approach near enough the extremity of the branches to catch it. Thus it appears, after all his toil, the hungry Hollander would be in danger of losing his reward. But our acquaintance with these countries is very slight; and as but little is known,

* Mr. Malthus's Essays, p. 19.

any thing is credited by certain readers; it is with them the age of the marvellous, and Mr. M. has availed himself of their credulity in support of his theory. When we are better informed, the thin population of these countries will, I have no doubt, be more rationally accounted for.

Our author next describes the miseries of the American Indians, and then directs his course to the islands of the South Sea, of which Otaheite attracts his greatest attention. The first check to the population of that people, is the systematic licentiousness of the higher orders; by whom societies are formed, under the name of Eareeoie, for the express purpose of promiscuous intercourse among the members; and under the engagement, that, all the children born in the society be murdered.

Giving full credit to the account, the object of our attention is, the extent of the abominable practice, and its influence, as a check to the population of the island, which must necessarily be very small, for these societies are limited to the higher classes.

The next check mentioned, is that of infanticide. Here Mr. M. argues with Mr. Hume, "that the permission of infanticide generally con-

tributes to increase the population of a country. By removing the fears of too numerous a family, it encourages marriage, and the powerful yearnings of nature prevent parents from resorting to so cruel an expedient, except in extreme cases."* But Mr. M. thinks, in Otaheite there are no yearnings of nature, and that it is probable children are murdered rather as a fashion, than a resort of necessity.† Such a surmise is beneath a reply. It is a gross insult to the human race. The fashion of one country may have been, or may become, the fashion of another. Had Mr. M. been a father, he would not have thought so meanly of parental feelings.

The next check noticed by our author, is, the wantonness of the women; and there is something, not quite agreeable to Mr. M's. notions, in the marriage ceremony, which consists of a present from the man to the parents of the girl. "The checks to population from such a state of society would alone appear sufficient to counteract the effects of the most delightful climate and the most exuberant plenty."‡

Let my readers ask themselves, whether the vices of the great, which the bulk of the people

* Page 52. † P. 52. ‡ P. 53.

do not imitate, can possibly stop the current of population? or whether a crime, at which a mother's feelings recoil, can become a fashion? or whether the licentiousness of the women at Otaheite can lessen the number of their children? As adjutors to the above, war, human sacrifices, and famine, are mentioned; but as they hold only a secondary place in Mr. M's. estimation, it is unnecessary to dwell on them.

The checks to population among pastoral nations, Mr. M. states to be, inability to purchase a wife, vicious customs, with respect to women, epidemics, wars, famine, and the diseases arising from extreme poverty. These checks are assuredly sufficient to keep down the population of any state; but whether their operations are felt more powerfully in Tartary than in America, I shall not attempt to decide. Thus much, however, I may say, that the pastoral life does not seem to expose to want, or to pestilence, or to present any very formidable bars to marriage.

In speaking of the checks to population in different parts of Africa, our author directs his readers, as usual, to war, famine, and pestilence; but not a word is mentioned of the slave trade. British ships alone, transport from that country,

70 or 80000 of its youths annually; which must act as a check to its population; and of such an extent as but few countries sustain from all the evils of war, famine, and pestilence, taken together. How is it that Mr. M., who is so sharp-sighted as often to see misery where others speak of happiness, should overlook this source of it. I hope he is not afraid of giving offence, by speaking the truth. A gap is made, but we do not learn how it is filled up, if filled at all. It is a check Mr. M. does not choose to notice. Whether Africa presents a yawning chasm, frightful to an European to contemplate; and whether the manners of the people are improved by their long intercourse with those who trade in their blood, and in this way receive a little compensation for their loss, remain to be told.

In Turkey, and Persia, the influence of the civil government, in discouraging agriculture, and thus producing famine and its consequences, forces itself on Mr. M's. notice. A people perishing for want, in a country that may well be called the garden of the world, carries the mind so directly to the maxims and policy of the government, that it is impossible for Mr. M. to screen it, by accusing the laws of nature.

The countries next noticed by our author,

are, Indostan and Tibet. But here there is very little for the extraordinary ministers of death to do. Neither war, famine, or pestilence are noticed, but in the way of conjecture. There are beggars,* hence he supposes there is scarcity; and epidemics are said to be the consequences of scarcity and bad nourishment.† Here Mr. M. ascribes to epidemics their true origin. There are also some customs common to these countries, which Mr. M. thinks are hinderances to the increase of population.---Allowing to Mr. M. the full force of all his observations, it does not appear, that the people of Tibet suffer, from vice, misery, and moral restraint, in an equal proportion with other countries. Indostan is full of people, and, on Mr. M's. general principle, ought to furnish its quota of victims. Mr. M., indeed, mentions celibacy as a check affecting some casts; but celibacy is a check to population in all countries, especially to those in which the catholic religion is professed; yet in them, war, famine, and pestilence perform the principal part in lessening the population, and in keeping it, as Mr. M. says, on a level with the subsistence. Why the east, especially China, does

* Page 143. † Pa. 139.

not suffer in proportion to the other quarters of the globe, is a problem Mr. M's. theory does not solve: it is not because of celibacy, for the institutions of the country particularly encourage marriage; nor can Mr. M. fix it on any other check.

The chapters on the checks to population in Greece and Rome, are not sufficiently interesting to engage our attention; we shall therefore pass on to those which follow,---Norway and Sweden. Of Norway, some remarks have already been made; the present respect Sweden.

So long as Mr. M. treated of remote or barbarous countries, the assertion, that, war, famine, or pestilence, operated with such force as to keep down the population to a level with the actual quantity of subsistence, was almost sufficient to satisfy the mind of its truth. These evils are well known to have existed, and Mr. M. has fixed their extent to be exactly equal to the tendency to increase; and as more accurate information could not be obtained, its incorrectness could not be demonstrated; except by comparing the checks which operate in one country with those which affect another, and such, from the nature of things, as have been attempted. But we have now entered on the

examination of chapters which treat of civilized nations; in which every circumstance relating to population is registered with a correctness sufficiently nice for general inferences.

Sweden, Mr. M. informs us, is, in many respects, in a similar state to Norway.* A very large proportion of its population being in the same manner employed in agriculture, of course the same effect follows, and celibacy is the principal check to population in Sweden, as it is stated to be in Norway. But Mr. M. does not assent to this inference. He says, the check by celibacy is not so complete as in Norway; and, consequently, the positive checks operate more forcibly. His leading proof is, that, in Sweden, the yearly average mortality is to the population as 1 to 34 and three fourths;† and the yearly marriages as 1 to 112. Here the period of life is shorter, and the proportion of marriages less, than in Norway. From hence, Mr. M. infers, that the marriages are contracted at an earlier age; an inference, of which this is no proof. On the contrary, it would not be difficult to make it appear, that marriages are entered into at nearly the same age in every

* P. 196. † P. 197.

country in Europe. But it suits Mr. M's. theory, to show, that famine and pestilence were actively concerned in diminishing the population of Sweden. It so happens, however, that all that is said of Sweden applies also to Norway. A few cargoes of corn are imported into Sweden, for the use of the distilleries; but, on the other hand, fish are exported. If bread is not so abundant as in other countries, it is not so much wanted; a more nutritious diet than bread is suited to the climate. It is not so much a scarcity of corn which constitutes a famine in these countries, as a scarcity of fish, of cheese, of milk, and of meat.

Here I may notice a circumstance worthy some attention. In these countries, flesh is preserved fit for use, without the application of salt, by being cut into thin slices and thoroughly dried. This custom is also practised by the inhabitants of Davis's Streights: and I have been informed, that the minister of the French marine, some time since, ordered a trial of it to be made, for the use of the navy. Should it succeed, it will be of benefit to sailors on long voyages; but especially to those who may have the means of obtaining provisions, but have no salt to preserve them.

As to epidemic diseases, it is not probable that two contiguous nations, resembling each other in manners, should be unlike in this respect. A line of demarkation is not observed by pestilence.

*Of the Checks to Population in Russia.* If the registers of this country are to be relied on, there are more female children die than male. In the period from 1781 to 1785, of 1000 boys born, in Petersburgh, 147 only, died within the first year, but of the same number of girls 310.* This, I expected, would have been noticed as a very operative check, but Mr. M. passes it over; as he does also a long account of the foundling hospital, which appears, in Russia, as in every other nation where they are established, to be more injurious than beneficial; and fixes his attention on the government. Russia, he says, wants nothing but greater freedom of industrious exertion, and an adequate vent for its commodities in the interior parts of the country, to occasion an increase of population astonishingly rapid.† Here Mr. Malthus adopts an idea, which, if he had pursued, would have led him to the principles I hope to establish. But he

* P. 214. † P. 220.

has confounded the population of a country with its commerce. Rome was never a commercial city. Poland supplies many markets with her corn, but an increase in population does not follow. Commerce greatly promotes civilization, but is not essential to it: but there is a connection between civilization and population, which is essential, which is uniform, and which is permanent.

The next chapter treats *of the Fruitfulness of Marriages.* On this chapter Mr. M. has bestowed considerable labour; but its merits chiefly concern, and will be best appreciated by, the political arithmetician. It presents nothing which claims our consideration. It does not lead one step forward in natural philosophy. Facts are mentioned, but their cause is not pointed out. The incorrectness of registers are shown; but the well-known fact, that the women of some countries are more prolific than of others, is not attempted to be explained.

*Of the Checks to Population in the middle Parts of Europe.* The principal design of this chapter, is, to show the dependence of the marriages on the deaths. But I have already made so many remarks on this subject, as to render it unnecessary again to enter minutely into it.

The axiom Mr. M. lays down, is, that marriages and deaths mutually influence each other;* and he quotes, in its support, the authority of Susmilch, who appears to have had considerable opportunities, and to have bestowed much labour in making the registers of different countries speak the same language. The fact that most attracts Mr. M's. notice, and which he thinks most forcibly illustrates his principles, is that of 22 Dutch villages, before noticed, of which he writes thus: "In them, according to Susmilch, out of 64 persons there is one annual marriage. When I first saw this number mentioned, not having then adverted to the mortality in these villages, I was much astonished, and very little satisfied with Susmilch's attempt to account for it, by talking of the great number of trades, and the various means of getting a livelihood, in Holland, as it is evident, that, the country having been long in the same state, there would be no reason to expect any great yearly accession of new trades and new means of subsistence, and the old ones would of course all be full. But the difficulty was immediately solved, when it appeared that the mortality was

* Page 243.

between 1 in 22 and 1 in 23, instead of being 1 in 36, as is usual when the marriages are in the proportion of 1 in 108. The births and deaths were nearly equal. The extraordinary number of marriages was not caused by the opening of any new sources of subsistence, and therefore produced no increase of population. It was merely occasioned by the rapid dissolution of the old marriages by death, and the consequent vacancy of some employment by which a family might be supported."*

This sentence contains at once an epitome of our author's sentiments, and one of his most striking illustrations, the old 'situations', he says, would, of course, be full; by which he means, the principle of increase is so strong, that a situation, capable of giving subsistence to a family, will never want an occupier. But it happens, very unfortunately for Mr. M., that the statement he relies so much upon, cannot be true, in the very nature of things, as he proves. Speaking of England, he says, "It will not, I believe, be very far from the truth, to say, that, in this country, not more than half of the prolific power of nature is called into action,

* Pa. 241.

yet, that there are more children born than the country can possibly support. If we suppose that the yearly births were one twentieth part of the population, a proportion, which, for short periods, obtains frequently on the continent, and constantly, perhaps, in many parts of America; and allowing one third for the mortality under 20, which is a moderate supposition, as, according to Dr. Short, this mortality, in some places, is only one fifth or one fourth; then if all were to marry at 20, which is by no means so early an age as is possible, one thirtieth part of the population would, in that case, marry annually; that is, there would be one annual marriage out of 60 persons."*

If it be but just possible, under a combination of the most favourable circumstances of health, age, and fruitfulness, that annual marriages should be contracted at the rate of one to 60 persons, when the unhealthfulness of the climate of Holland is taken into the account, the whole statement, respecting the 22 Dutch villages, falls to the ground. It never can happen, in any country, that every individual will marry at 20; that two thirds of the born live to be

* P. 303.

married; and that the annual mortality is one in 23. Extreme healthiness, and extreme mortality, can never meet.

*Of the Checks to Population in France.* Our author makes no remarks in consequence of the incorrectness of the registers in that country; but he enters into a calculation, to prove, that France can send 150000 men annually to her armies, without diminishing her population.

The chapter which treats *of the Checks to Population in England,* is very long, but not easy to understand. I suppose our author means, that celibacy is the check to population. But the chief part is taken up in the examination of registers, which have but little relation to the subject.

Our author next treats *of the Checks to Population in Scotland and Ireland.* The statistical account of Scotland, lately published, is, in the estimation of Mr. Malthus, replete with facts illustrative of his theory. After detaining the reader with an unnecessary enquiry whether marriages are entered into earlier or later than formerly, which question he cannot decide, and after a few other investigations of as little interest, our author finds himself seated on his favourite stalking horse, the dread of famine. I am very

far from questioning the truth of the statements produced; the question is not, whether a state, at any time, has lost part of its population by war, famine, or pestilence,---but whether their recurrence have been sufficiently often, and sufficiently intense, to act as a perpetual check on its increase in population. That this has not been the case in Scotland might be proved; but I have designedly avoided enlarging my chapters by a multiplicity of quotations, and have rather confined myself to the natural consequences that arise from the operation of the check to population under discussion.

In this chapter, the leading check is famine; and I argue, that it cannot often have been felt by the Scotch. First, because their shores are much frequented by fish, and their land well stocked with cattle; and especially, because certain articles of food, common in other countries, are not used in Scotland. A Highlander would, at this day, as soon eat a crocodile as an eel, or any part of a hog. It is the nature of the frequent pressure of scarcity to overcome such antipathies; and when once overcome, if the articles loathed are proper food, they soon become common. The French entertained an idea that potatoes were poisonous, but the scar-

city they sustained in the late war, compelled the use of them; and it is presumed the apprehension of poison has ceased, never to be revived. The Danes, in the spring, mix saw-dust with flour, and do not repine at such food. An army besieged, and in distress for the means of subsistence, eat their horses; and however reluctant they may be to taste the first morsel, afterwards they will not suffer hunger if they can satisfy it in that manner. Reflecting on these facts, I am induced to believe, the Scotch have never lived in the dread of famine, nor often felt its force.

For an acquaintance with the other subjects treated of by Mr. Malthus, as they are rather inferences and deductions from the parts of his work which have been noticed, I refer to the book itself. I might have gone on pointing out our author's inconsistencies, and detecting his errors, but I should have received no pleasure, nor the argument much force, by such exposures. It is the principles the work was written to support, that I seek to expose and refute; they are to me extremely offensive, as they are wholly incompatible with revelation, as they forbid the expectation of any improvement in the condition of man, and as they sanction the worst of rulers in the worst of crimes.

As to the execution of the book, it has been a work of some labour. But the illustrations of the subject are arranged in a way to perplex, rather than direct. We see the confusion of a wood, rather than the order of a vista. And not unfrequently the most contradictory circumstances are related in the same chapter. But were the principles tenable, a little of that application the author appears capable of, would rectify such blemishes.

# FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

OF THE

*Principles of Population.*

## INTRODUCTION.

AS I have criticised the arguments with freedom, and totally objected to the principles, advanced by Mr. Malthus, it is but fair that I state my own sentiments on the subject. Preparatory to which, I shall take a hasty glance at the history of the world. The precise circumstances of the human race before the flood, the then state of civilization and knowledge, are for ever lost; but, from the general facts that are recorded, we learn that calamities and crimes were, in those remote ages, at least as common, and their consequences as fatal, as are now experienced.

Already I find myself at variance with Mr. Malthus, for that which is necessary cannot be criminal; however, I shall persevere in calling vice by that epithet. Since the flood, events have been more minutely recorded, which has enabled us to judge, in some measure, of the transactions of every generation.

In the first ages after the flood, the life of man embraced a much longer period than is ever now attained, and population in consequence made rapid progress. After living as one family nearly 300 years, and becoming numerous, the human race separated; after which, we read, that the checks to population Mr. M. applies so generally, and considers as first principles in government, were severely felt. War, with its consequences, thinned the world of its people, and darkened the fair page of history with its horrid recitals. But under the pressure of many evils population increased; and, it is probable, in 1000 years after the flood, the world had recovered its inhabitants; such was the force of the principle of increase. But as Mr. Hume has written a very learned and ingenious essay, to prove that the ideas usually entertained of the population of the world, at the period I am speaking of, are incorrect, I shall suppose ano-

ther 1000 years to have rolled on, which brings us to the birth of Christ, when we have the most indubitable testimony that the world was well peopled.

At that period, the whole range of country, from the Alps to the Ganges, including Spain, Barbary, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and Persia, were extremely populous. Egypt alone, if her historians can be credited, contained as many people as the whole track does now. At that period, also, India, China, and Tartary, were probably as full of inhabitants as at present. Africa and America were either wholly unknown, or very imperfectly so; but it does not appear that these quarters of the globe were more thinly peopled than now. The inhabitants of the islands more recently discovered, trace their origin to a period anterior to the birth of Christ. Europe alone has gained in population. So that, on the whole, we shall not exceed the truth by saying, that, 1800 years ago, the world was as populous as in the days in which we live.

An enquiry into the cause of the decrease of population in some countries, its stationary state in others, and its gradual increase in a few, has long been instituted; and, by the politician to whom the enquiry has been principally confined,

the nature and administration of the laws of civil government have been thought sufficient to account for the disproportion which exists.--- They argue, that all arbitrary and bad governors, if strong enough, delight in war; if too weak to undertake a foreign war, the despot turns his power against his subjects; and agriculture, arts, and commerce languish, as in Turkey, while famine and pestilence, the certain consequences of such conduct, desolate the country. But, on the other hand, they represent a good government under the similitude of a parent who provides for the wants of every child, and secures the whole under one roof; equal happiness, and equal safety, are felt and enjoyed by each.

This view of the subject is satisfactory and pleasing, as far as it carries us, but it rather shows the responsibility and influence of governments, than determines by what laws the increase itself is directed. To protect a people is the duty of a magistrate, but this is not the principle of increase. There is something to be explained previously to the civil governor's assuming his authority.

Mr. Malthus has aimed at going a step further than the politician, and endeavours to

trace the subject to its first principles; in doing so, whatever responsibility may before have been attached to civil magistrates, so jealous is he of their honour, that he discharges them from all obligation, and rather than accuse them of being in any measure the cause of the evils that are felt in the world, he fixes his theory on principles that reduce man to a cipher,---a mere machine, which is impelled forward by some hidden cause, till it reaches a certain point, from whence it is thrust back: again it moves on, and again is returned. Such are the outlines of the two theories.

Mr. Malthus tells us, that population is always pressing hard upon the subsistence, and often gets beyond it; and that it is of no consequence what form of government a nation adopts, or how wisely it is administered, if population be not kept down by some rugged means, within the power of the magistrate, the whole world must become the abode of still greater wretchedness. The politician says, that a government adapted to the genius and temper of a people, is a certain token of an increasing population. Mr. Malthus, on the contrary, leads us to believe, that the government which attempts to promote the happiness of the people,

by diffusing knowledge and encouraging industry and virtue, are pursuing a measure that must end in destruction.

It is evident, that neither of these theories are defensible. The politician confines himself wholly to secondary causes; Mr. Malthus, in endeavouring to carry his ideas further, dishonours the first,---and, by so doing, sanctions despotism, and promotes infidelity!

What other principles are adapted to explain the nature, and to regulate the increase of the human race, will be the subject of the following chapters.

## *Of the Duration of the Life of Man.*

HAD opinions, similar to those Mr. Malthus has expressed, been published to the world 1500 years before the birth of Christ, they might have excited alarm. Population was rolling forward like a torrent, and covering the earth; and before this time, it might have been calculated from facts that the earth would not be large enough for one generation to stand upon, much less to supply it with the means of subsistence. A principle of increase so strong was well calculated to fill the world with people, which being accomplished, its utility would cease; and some measure became necessary to prevent that which had been a good, from becoming the greatest evil. A measure was appointed. The grievous evils that are now in the world were in being then, and were they the natural checks to population, would, doubtless, have been called into

exercise; but they were passed by, their force was not increased.

The age of man, at that period, is stated to have been ten times as long as at present, consequently, had vice, misery, and moral restraint been the checks to population, they must have been ten times as powerful as we experience; some one or other of them would constantly have presented its horrid form, terrifying whilst it destroyed, and almost every individual must have fallen a sacrifice in the midst of his days. But it is doubted whether the natural life of man was longer, immediately after the deluge, than at the time in which we live. The objection is too important not to be attended to.

To prevent a long discussion, I shall confine myself to two remarks. First, the rate at which the world was repeopled; and, secondly, the progress made in civilization.

"There are plain traces, as well as tradition, of an universal deluge," (Hume, Essay xi). This being granted, the period when it happened cannot have been extremely remote, otherwise there would have been no tradition of it, for the most important events are forgotten in time. Many nations have no tradition of the country from whence they emigrated, though this, doubt-

less, would have been retained many generations; and events of still greater importance, in a longer period, would share the same fate. Hence, I argue, that, considering the account given by Moses of this event, as merely human authority, it cannot, in point of time, have been far from the truth.

This being granted, it is easy to prove, that eight persons cannot have increased to eight hundred millions in two thousand years, under the many evils to which the page of history informs us they were subject, without some advantage which we have not. They were either more prolific, or lived to a greater age, than the present generation: that they were not more prolific is almost certain; some were barren, and we read of none who bore more children than is common now. The only remaining inference, therefore, is, that their lives were of longer duration.

The other remark relates to the progress made in civilization. A country thinly peopled is never civilized, because the service of every individual is directed towards the means of subsistence and defence; hence they have neither leisure, security, or emulation to devote much time to study.

A thin population is incompatible with great attainments; emigrants feel its force, and lose their civilization, their knowledge, and their zeal, under such circumstances. But the arts and sciences were early in use in Egypt and through the east; it was their birth-place. Had a few people been thinly scattered over this vast extent of country, they would scarcely have felt the want of the sciences, much less have been led to the discovery of them.---A question naturally occurs: What gave rise to the early population, and consequent civilization, of those parts? War, famine, and pestilence, raged among the people, who doubtless sustained all the checks that are at present felt, and which now keep the population of the globe nearly stationary, but then the current flowed rapidly on. Did not some power, founded in the constitution, buoy up the principle of increase amidst all its obstacles, and enable it to triumph over them; what could this have been but the extended duration of life? I ask for another explanation of the fact. I ask, on what other principle the early population of the world can be accounted for?

But should a thin population not retard civilization, would it have been possible, with the

abilities man is endowed with, for the world ever to have been civilized, had his life never exceeded its present limits? We see Africa, America, and the isles of late discovery, all in barbarism; the inhabitants have had time to invent and improve the useful arts, and they have felt the want of such improvement by occasionally seeing others in their enjoyment, their natural abilities are not defective, but, through the many ages they have existed as distinct nations, they have continued in ignorance. The fault is not in them. I will venture to say, that no nation, since the birth of Christ, has ever become civilized, but by being acquainted with the discoveries that were made in the first ages after the deluge. Europeans possess a knowledge of these discoveries, but it is almost incredible at how slow a rate they have improved them; they manifest an inferiority; like the African, they appear unable to have taught themselves:--- To invent, is more difficult than to improve. But in what consisted the advantages of the ancients? Did they possess talents we do not? Had they stronger motives to study than we? No. How, then, can their superior attainments be accounted for, but by their enjoying a longer period of study.

Taking it for granted, that the life of man was as long as the scriptures represent it to have been, it is impossible that vice, misery, and moral restraint can have been applicable to man, in that state, for the purpose Mr. Malthus assigns them. These checks are all of the most distressing and afflictive kind, the capacity to bear which is limited; man can only sustain a certain portion of evil, and that portion is now felt. Increase its intenseness; imagine the vigour of a constitution adapted to last many centuries, and vice, misery, and moral restraint, the only checks to keep down population. As the world was never adapted to the support of a greater number of inhabitants, what would avail the strength of their constitutions? It would avail them nothing; it would render the struggle between the principle of increase, and the checks to it, the more violent; they are always grievous, but then they must have been insupportable. The inducements which operate to keep a people together must have been insufficient for that purpose. Look upon a country, checked in the increase of its population by these agents, and mark the effect. Look on Turkey; human existence is not highly valued there, because they abound,

and the evils of life exceed the good. Imagine the life of man in Turkey to be naturally as long again as ours, to keep the population to its present level, must not the afflictions of that people increase, and the unequal struggle desolate the land, by breaking the bonds of society? ---Any daring robber can draw round him a number of adherents, who are willing to undertake the most hazardous enterprises; had these men been happy they would not have abandoned their homes. The existence of a banditti always implies the abounding of the checks to population; it implies that society is attended by an evil which counterbalances the good of it: what besides could tempt their abandoning of it? It cannot be the love of honour, for no honour attaches to such conduct.---The mere circumstance of a people's being willing to return from a fixed and settled to a wandering and predatory way of life, is a proof of their wretchedness; it is a proof that the tie by which society is bound together, is not strong enough to resist the attacks made upon it. It is of no avail to accuse the government with remissness and a breach of duty, for if the age of man was as long as formerly, no government, however wisely constituted, could prevent an increase of the force

of the checks to population beyond what are endured in Turkey.

Again. A savage is well known to meet death, in its worst and most lingering forms, with fortitude: it is of no moment whether the victim be born in a hot or a cold region; if he be a man in the lowest and most degraded state in which the human race exist, he will sustain that character; what is common to all, must have a common origin, which will be found in the little pleasure life affords.---- Speaking of the negroes, Mr. Edwards says, "This contempt of death, or indifference about life, they bring with them to the West-Indies; but if fortunately they fall into good hands, and become well settled, they acquire by degrees other sentiments and notions. Nature assumes her lawful influence over them. With the consciousness of security, the love of existence also, amidst all the evils that attend it in a state of slavery, gains admission to their bosoms; they feel it, and such is the force of habitual barbarity, seem ashamed of their own weakness. A gentleman of Jamaica, visiting a valuable negro that was sick, and perceiving that he was thoughtful and dejected, endeavoured, by soothing and encouraging language, to raise his

drooping spirits: Massa, said the negro, in a tone of self reproach and conscious degeneracy, since me come to white man's country, me lub life too much." *(Hist. of West-Ind. p.* 70.)---Thus it appears that enjoyment is unfriendly to fortitude. But what most interests us is, the little value a negro sets on his life, and the direct reference to the little enjoyment in it as the cause. Remove the cause only in a slight degree, and the natural fondness for existence revives; increase it, and the extinction of the race must be the consequence---for that which is not valued is not protected: existence, under such circumstances, is disregarded and abandoned, by neglecting the duties essential to its continuance.---A people, suffering the afflictions endured in Africa, cannot improve their condition were the means in their power, for no motive to laudable ambition can be presented to their minds; despair would weigh them down as a perpetual load, which hope never lightens: and the whole world must have been in a still more wretched state, had the strong principle of increase which doubtless existed after the flood been checked only by the evils Mr. Malthus presents to our view as of invariable application and irresistible force.

But these may be deemed extreme and remote cases, and such as are inapplicable to the world at large; which, taken as a whole, may still be the abode of happiness. To this I reply, that man is not a solitary but a social being; he seeks pleasure in that state only, and the acquisition of pleasure increases the capacity for it, together with the susceptibility of pain. The rumour of a pestilential fever breaks these bonds, and drives a people into the most retired places, where their nearest relations are beheld with dread: the approach of a hostile army, or any other evil, begets a desire for individual safety, and the general good is abandoned. Thus it appears, that man, in any stage of civilization, encounters as much evil as is compatible with his existence in that state.

It may be further observed, in the present state of man, and under the best regulated governments, that it is doubtful, with some, whether the silence and solitude of a desert be not preferable to the busy hum and social intercourse of a populous country. Though to associate is natural, in confirmation of this idea, every old man tells us, he does not wish to live his life over again, in all the circumstances of it. Others, after looking for happiness in the world,

and finding none, refer us back to the age of ignorance, as if it dwelt there. Dr. Price, and other philosophers, justly celebrated both for wisdom and benevolence, have formed an opinion, that the sum of happiness is greater than that of misery; consequently it might bear some abridgment, without the order of society being materially deranged: but, from the facts just stated, I differ from these gentlemen. I contend, that happiness is nowhere in excess, yet, that misery is unnatural to man; it is a punishment inflicted, not the consequence of a law to be obeyed, it cannot be accumulated beyond a certain measure, and that measure is now full; in society man can bear no more: he was formed for happiness, every part of his economy points to this interesting fact. Pain, or suffering of any kind, when once past, is forgotten; it seems foreign to our nature; and is the reverse of what Mr. Malthus represents it to be: the mind takes no hold of it. But pleasure, once experienced, is afterwards revived, and plays in the imagination, enlivening time that in itself possesses no agreeable object. Remembrance is a source of joy, but corporeal affliction is not thus a source of misery, nor can it be, in the nature of man. The sailor

forgets the sufferings of his voyage, the privation of food, the danger of shipwreck, as soon as he makes his destined port. A mother forgets her sufferings on nursing her infant. No association of ideas can convey a feeling similar to that experienced in the gout, though a fit had but recently been endured. Hence, I argue, that misery is foreign to man; it is not adapted to him: it is either actually present, or he has not a proper conception of it; and if present, that weight of it could not be sustained which would be sufficient to keep population from increasing, when the tendency to it was as strong as it is represented to have been.

With all these illusions, these advantages over the real state of our existence, there is so much of actual suffering as to overbalance the good, and to make the stoutest heart sometimes weary of life, and bear it from the dread of a worse, or the hope of a better. If such be the state of our existence under its best circumstances, what must it have been when life was drawn out to 700 years? Had vice, misery, and moral restraint been the only checks by which this strong principle of increase could be kept within the limits of the means of subsistence, with such an increase of the force of these

checks as such vigour in the constitution supposes, could the affairs of the world have gone on? Would it ever have been civilized? Would man have sought to have known his Maker, that he might worship him? would he not rather have taken up his abode with the beasts of the field, and have lived like them, a prey to each other.

When the world was repeopled, and vice and misery, on Mr. Malthus's theory, were about to exert their full influence, the life of man was shortened by the Giver of it; how unlike the calling in the aid of vice and misery. In this check there was nothing afflictive; the feelings of no one were injured; dismay and desolation were not scattered by the hand of violence, nor was the progress of knowledge wholly interrupted: it had received its direction, and went forward: one individual sunk to his grave earlier than his predecessors, but equally as old in constitution, and as incapable of enjoying the pleasures of life: to an old man death does not appear as an enemy, and a broken constitution is old age.---Although I speak of shortening the duration of life as the appointment of God, it does not follow that it was effected in any other way than by the operation of the laws of nature: it was

gradual: the seed of this event might have been sown in the constitution as well as the seed of death. It is not uncommon for a person to grow old sooner than his father; and the only remark it occasions is, that he had a weaker constitution. The constitutions of the generations that flourished immediately after the flood, might, in like manner, one after another, become less robust, and less capable of resisting so great a weight of years.---To those who persist in the idea, that the patriarchs lived no longer than we do, and as the bible is probably a book of no authority with such, I refer to Sancthoniatho, Berosus, Diodorus, Siculus, and other ancient authors, who relate the same fact.

I have dwelt the longer on this subject, in the hope of establishing two points: first, that man, as a social being, cannot sustain any considerable increase of evil, consequently, that it cannot be applied under all circumstances; and, secondly, that the momentum given to the principle of increase, when greater than was consistent with permanent utility, was checked in an unobserved, undistressing, but decisive and sufficient manner. These points being granted, their application to Mr. Malthus's theory is obvious.

Whether the life of man, which was reduced to threescore years and ten at the time David wrote, be not further shortened, is a consideration entitled to notice. By the age of man, it is evident David meant the age of activity and usefulness, not the extreme period of life, when every nerve is unstrung, and the mind is as feeble as the body: in the description he gives, it is not till after threescore years and ten the infirmities of old age break in upon the constitution, and commence the period in which labour and sorrow announce approaching death. By the life of man, cannot be intended the life of here and there an individual; if so, it might with equal propriety have been fixed at a much shorter or even a longer period; but I apprehend David meant the attainable age of nearly the whole of the human race, and that in the full exercise of their faculties, and with a good portion of bodily vigour. We say of a horse, that its life is 32 years; by which is meant, that horses, whose health has not been injured by hard work, by unreasonable confinement or improper food, generally live so many years. In the same way, I apprehend, we are to consider what is said of the human race.

As we are without any extensive means of

ascertaining to what age the people of different countries lived, at the time we are speaking of, as we have no registers to refer to, we must content ourselves with such facts as are recorded. On turning over Anacharsis's travels, I noted down the ages of eighteen Greeks, which were successively presented, and on casting up the amount, although some died by the hands of the executioner, yet one with another they lived above 70 years.* The same author, speaking of the Egyptians, says, their priests, by cultivating the most beneficial part of medicine, or that which is more employed to prevent than to cure diseases, have at all times procured themselves a long and tranquil life. *V.* 4. *p.* 186.---It would be possible to glean from ancient authors many facts in support of the opinion, that 70 years was a period attained by a considerable part of the population of the early ages. But it concerns us most to enquire, whether the life of man has not been again shortened, the registers of the European states make it only 36 years, which is little more than the half of what

* Theseus lived 62 years, Lycurgus 85, Solon 80, Pythagoras 90, Simonides 90, Æschylus 69, Pindar 65, Anexagoras 72, Sophocles 91, Demochretus 90, Euripides 78, Thucydides 80, Socrates 70, Isocrates 98, Plato 82, Demosthenes 63, Aristotle 62, Themestocles 65.

I apprehend it should be. This most alarming consideration ought to excite a serious enquiry whether this shortness of life be in consequence of our misconduct, or whether our constitutions will admit of its being no longer. A large proportion of the deaths being in childhood and youth, reduce the probability of life below what a casual observer would estimate it at; but I apprehend no person now would calculate the life of man at more than 50 years, if he judged only of the adults. But there are some facts that point this out as not being the full term that might be attained: the registers of some villages, kept with considerable attention, make the life of all the born above 60 years: for the whole kingdom of Norway it is 48; and Dr. Percival communicated to Dr. Price the registers of some parishes, by which it appeared that only 1 in 75 died annually. But all these modes of estimating life are liable to deceive, either by omissions, or by some circumstance which affected the population being kept out of sight; they are therefore not sufficient authority.

The next fact I shall mention is liable to fewer objections; I mean the advanced age to which the nobility and gentry of this kingdom

arrive; their elevated rank holds them up to so much public notice, that the truth of any general remark respecting them is easily ascertained; it is impossible to be deceived on the subject. Sir George Staunton says, "it has been calculated, upon the authority of facts and observations, that, notwithstanding the baneful luxuries in which the European rich indulge, and the disorders of repletion, inactivity and vice, to which they are subject, the mean duration of their lives exceeds by ten years that of their inferiors." *Embassy to China, v.* 1. *p.* 74.---In confirmation of this authority, visit the House of Peers, observe that venerable body of senators, and the sentiment will instantly be impressed on the mind, that 70 years was not more than the natural term of their lives. No class of the community besides can produce so many vigorous old men without being selected; but there is no natural cause why they do not. In addition to occular evidence, let there be noted down, from sufficient authority, and that of the newspapers of the day is perhaps as proper as any, the ages at which the members of the most dignified families have died during the last century, and it will be found that few have sunk into their graves under 60, and many have

attained to 90 years and upwards. The engagements of a peer are not more conducive to health than those of the other parts of the community, but they value life, and endeavour to preserve it; in sickness they give every facility to its removal; their liberal education directs them to approve and adopt the best means; persons less enlightened adopt also such measures as they approve, but mistaken notions lead them to inferior sources of information.--- Whatever advantages the superior classes of the community may have over the lower, they have none in the natural vigour of their constitutions; if they attain to 70 years, so may others: hence it does not appear that an irrevocable change has passed on the constitution since the time that our life was said to be threescore years and ten. What is here rendered probable becomes certain, by the consideration that a shorter term is not sufficient for the duties of life. The years of childhood and youth are passed before the consequence and dignity of the man is felt, which consumes a large portion of our time: marriage contracted, or business entered upon, before these stages of our existence are fully completed, is premature, and commonly unwise: a boy in trade is in danger of

being duped, and still more of becoming one: a boy at the head of a family wants discretion to direct it.

Of late years an effort has been made to mature the judgment and push the youth up to the man by an early introduction to company and business, I fear the experiment has often failed; but be this as it may, there are few young men fit to be ushered into life, and to take the charge of a business, before they have some time passed their twentieth year; and still fewer are considered, by other tradesmen, as possessed of sufficient experience and information to advise others, or to manage their own affairs with due judgment, before they have been fifteen years or more in trade; by which time a man, in his own estimation, is fast hastening to the decline of life; he may mistake indolence for weakness, but at 40, the prospect appears too short to allow any one to think of embarking in a new pursuit, in commerce or in literature; the world would doubt of his success, and his friends lament the occasion of so unseasonable an effort. At forty, most men are bent on retiring, that they may spend a few years in quietude and peace, according to the inclination of their minds, and the requirements of their constitution: ardor, enter-

prise, and hope, are now at an end: they accumulated a fortune, when alone, in their estimation, it could be obtained, and have retired, with this only consolation, that, to their other afflictions, poverty is not added.

Were this the whole business of life, it would be a gift of comparatively little value. On this view of it, the exertions of the successful are just sufficient to secure the means of subsistence for a few years of infirmity and decay. Man is certainly a nobler being than merely to be made the passport of merchandise; it is estimating his life as of no worth, so to compute it: but a far more dignified office awaits him. Trade is an honorable and useful mean of acquiring a competency, which is part of the business of life, as education is a part, but after this object is in many instances accomplished, there is thirty years of inestimable value and of high enjoyment, if properly spent; but if this period be lounged away, under the notion that indolence is felicity, and the best means of protracting life is to spend it in a round of formal, insipid visits, injurious in their influence and irksome in their execution, life is a toil. The man, retired from the busy scenes of life, is more than ever a blessing or a curse to society: if he pos-

sess true worth, he gives place to others, because the end he had in view is accomplished, and commences a career of greater and more extensive utility: he beautifies his dwelling, and lays out his grounds, in such a way as implies order, harmony, and taste; this he does from a love to the beautiful, commonly connected with a love of virtue, and out of respect to his own reputation. Thus established, it becomes his pleasure and his study to instruct the ignorant, to advise the young, and to direct the inexperienced; he takes care of the orphan, he watches over the public morals, he promotes public worship, he rewards merit, he succours the oppressed, he aids in the most prompt and liberal manner every institution calculated to advance the interest or to add to the beauty of his place of residence, and of the country at large; he cultivates the love of order and a thirst for knowledge; ignorance and vice he banishes from his sphere of action, or renders them odious; but above all, he exemplifies, in his personal relations, the spirit and dignity of the christian character. Such men have lived, and stand first among the benefactors of mankind, and have in general been of those who had spent part of their lives in commercial pursuits.

From the dignity and the obligations of man

I derive an argument in favor of 70 years of vigour,---his duties require it.

Again,---an early old age impels to early marriage; but at the earliest age at which marriage can be contracted there is no assurance of its continuing undissolved till the children that are the fruits of it are brought up: but animals are no longer prolific than the strength of their constitutions promises ample time for rearing their young, and is nature more unkind in providing for the offspring of the human race than for those of an animal? This very circumstance supposes some undue curtailing of the life of man.---But suppose a marriage is not thus dissolved, the man who marries at 25 and continues in business till he is 50, and then retires, disgusted with its cares and incapable of tasting its pleasures, calls himself an old man, whose business in life is over; but his youngest child is only just out of the cradle, and requires a parent's care for twenty years to come, Who is to render it? Its parents cannot; the image of death has already cast its shadow over them, and they wait, amidst decrepitude and imbecility, its final stroke; they are incompetent to the office to which they are appointed: Where is the fault? Is it in the laws of nature,---or has man, by vio-

lating those laws, injured his constitution?---- To be a father at fifty may reasonably be expected by him who marries at twenty-five, but in the present length of our lives, nature has made no provision for such offspring; they are produced, an obligation is incurred which cannot be fulfilled. At furthest, a man at sixty is seeking a gleam of happiness where he can find it, and catches at it in shadows; pleased with the prattling of the child, he lays aside the duties of a parent, and converts his important charge into a mere plaything,---a toy, to beguile a weary hour; and thus the child's whole life is in danger of being rendered useless, if not corrupt.

Aristotle considered the proper age of marriage, for men, to be 37, and for women, 18; this philosopher would not have mentioned so late a period, if in a very few years the active concerns of life would become a toil, and if possible be avoided. But, at the age when we dream of dotage, the Greeks were busily employed; life was not over with them at 40 or 50, but at a much later period they were ardently engaged in instructing the young, or in some other way serving their country. Besides, in the common way of estimating life, its parts bear no proportion to each other; the imbeci-

lity of childhood passes so rapidly into the decrepitude of age, that life is almost divided between them.---It is not thus with animals, many of them live for many years in full vigour; but in general they live eight times as long as they are in coming to maturity: thus we say, a horse lives 8 times 4 years, a dog 8 times 18 months, and thus of other animals. A calculation of this kind does not accurately apply to man, but it is rational to expect a nearer resemblance than is now found.

There is another observation I wish to make, which considerably illustrates the subject: The female economy is so appointed as to be peculiarly adapted to a life of 70 years; by 45 the mother ceases to add to the number of her children, and in 25 more her children cease to need her care: here the business of life closes, society has no further demand, and the generation hastens to its end. An earlier death I conceive to be a premature one, and a later is not to be desired.

I am aware that the preceding remarks, if true at all, will be thought applicable to only a very small part of the globe: the Africans, the aborigines of America, and the East-Indians, they say, do not attain so great an age as Eu-

ropeans, nor do their constitutions seem adapted to it. This opinion, though commonly received and credited, appears to me unsupported by proper evidence. What are the proofs, that the whole family of man, as they have equal duties have not an equal space to fulfil them in? One remark is, that the slaves in the West-Indies generally die young. To this, it is answered, that some have been known to live till they were eighty, and in Africa negroes are not reputed old till they are between fifty and sixty, and Europeans cannot plead a longer exemption; and there is no more reason to suppose the Africans live out the whole natural period of their lives than Europeans: an improvement in their habits would probably increase the duration of their lives.---Dr. Robinson, and after him Mr. Malthus, estimate the lives of the American Indians at something less than Europeans; this is doubtful as a general fact, and certainly untrue in particular instances, for it is not uncommon for individuals to reach their hundredth year.---As to the East-Indians, I presume it will not be contested that their constitutions are not as well adapted to a life of 70 years as our own. But it will be further objected, that, as in warm climates marriage is contracted earlier, so it hastens

the approach of old age. This is perfectly true, but the laws of nature are not in fault; sensual gratifications are at once the study and the bane of hot climates: children are married at the age of ten or twelve, and thus the constitution is broken before it is formed: it was not designed by nature that children or even youths should marry; there are duties proper to those ages, but marriage is not one of them; inclination is not always a sufficient motive, it is not the guide by which we are to be directed,---the maturity of the mind is the circumstance chiefly to be regarded: there is a time when the manly character is assumed; when the pursuits and the pastimes of the boy no longer please, it is then the mind is matured, and marriage may be contracted as a pledge of future happiness. But, in the east, no respect is paid to the understanding,---theirs is not a rational contract. In many civilized countries the marriageable age is directed, or at least advised, by the government: in America, the age of 18 is thought old enough; in England, 21 is preferred; but in the east mere children are connected by this tie. Is there sufficient reason for this conduct? Is it justifiable in any law of nature? Certainly not. The natives of hot climates are not required to

marry, before their judgments are informed, any more than Europeans; neither ought they. Had the institutors of the customs of the east been guided by a wise and enlightened policy, it would have been their study to have protracted the maturing of the constitutions of their people, in place of presenting every incitement to provoke and hasten them. Suppose, in this, or in any other country still further north, it was instilled into the minds of the children, that it would be proper they should marry when they had reached their twelfth year, and that the same attention was paid to them which such a consideration warrants, would it not have a very considerable effect in maturing the body? The reverse of such opinions should be forcibly inculcated on the children born in the east, and then, like ours, they would enjoy the pleasures of childhood and youth,---in place of being hurried, by the premature ripeness of a tainted imagination, from the cradle to fill the important station of a husband or a wife. The human economy is much influenced by external circumstances. A youth, brought up in the country, and another in some situations in a town, are as different in this respect as in their characters. When the people of hot climates shall act towards their chil-

dren as the guardians of their morals and the formers of their understandings, a premature youth will not lead to a premature marriage; nor the people complain that their lives are shorter than other persons.

I might here make some remarks on the way by which life is abridged of its natural duration in various parts of the globe, and in different stages of civilization; and from hence have proved, that the proper age of man is, in every region of the world, the same. That if a nobleman lives longer than the peasant, and that if the peasants of one country live longer than those of another, it does not arise from the nature of their constitutions, but from their conduct. But all I designed was, to prove that the age of man is threescore years and ten, and that no reduction can be expected to take place: if this be accomplished my object is attained.

OF THE

# INCREASE OF ANIMALS.

IN the judgment of those philosophers who found theories on external characters, there is a redundancy, an unnecessary waste of creative power, in all the works of God. Africa is bounded by a desert, which it is impossible to render otherwise; the arctic circles are inhospitable and rude, unfit for the abode of man; the ocean itself is calculated to destroy, rather than protect, the nobler parts of the animal creation; myriads of seed, brought to perfection, fall to the ground and perish; some animals are venemous, others ravenous, and seem to exist only that they may destroy; children are born and grow up idiots, others pass from the cradle to the grave. These vast regions of silence and of danger, these instances of cruelty and death, are lamented, by superficial observers, who conclude, because their utility is not apparent, that

they possess none; and hence the wisdom of the Creator is disputed.

Upon the principle of condemning what is not understood, Mr. Malthus has written his book. In his opinion, a few privileged individuals are alone permitted to enjoy the fruits of the earth, whilst the greater part of the population of the world, like the desert of Zaara, is calculated only to injure. To blot the desert from the universe is not in our power; but Mr. Malthus has pointed out the means by which the world is freed from its injurious population. However pleased our author may be with the idea that other parts of nature correspond with the overflowing and useless numbers of the human race, when the globe is contemplated as a whole, and as having been formed by design to answer a given purpose, no void or empty space, no exuberance, no want can be discovered: as the utility of every part is not equally apparent, the observer is silent where he cannot decide; he, however, sees enough that is good to believe all is such, and to increase his knowledge he enquires, and expresses his half discoveries in conjecture; of those places where no vegetables grow, no animals breathe, he believes them useful in giving repose, and in restoring the

salubrity of the atmosphere, after the incessant decompositions to which it is subjected in the habitable parts of the earth. If he cannot discover the usefulness of an idiot, or of a still-born infant, he is not bold enough to say there is no wisdom or consistency in the scheme of providence respecting them.

The brute creation presents as many seeming blank, unproductive, and useless parts, as the globe itself, or as the race of man: and as animals are below us in the scale of creation, and familiar to us by daily observation, we are able, in some measure, to comprehend the benefit one part derives from another, and to judge of the dependence of the parts on the whole: and as brutes are endowed with a stronger principle of increase than man, by enquiring by what means their increase is checked, and they kept down to the level of their food, we may be assisted in our further enquiries.

In a country, fenced round and cultivated, man is the check: thousands of animals bleed to supply his table; he protects and then destroys them, and their number is balanced by his wants. This conduct has the semblance of cruelty, and Mr. M. would rank it under the head misery, but it does not admit of such a character: the

animals we use us food seldom die of sickness and disease, and it was never designed they should, as I shall hereafter attempt to prove. Death, in any form, is horrible,---but I do not know that a sudden extinction of life is more so than after a lingering disease; besides, the length of the life of a domestic animal, notwithstanding its being subjected to the will of man, is greater than those of the same species in the wild state: they are more numerous in our pastures than in the forest, consequently, their lives being better protected, in the aggregate, are longer; and thus any idea of man's inflicting misery upon them, by putting them to death, loses its force. Man does not add to the misery of animals that sport in meadows made fertile by his labour; if they die by his hands, he shields them from many dangers, and thus increases the sum of their happiness. But all animals are not under the care and protection of man: in the forest he has no influence, he has not even a habitation, and his right to controul and appropriate the feeblest animal would be contested by the stronger. In the forest, the lion and the panther, the leopard and the rhinoceros, make their dens, and reign undisturbed masters: if one be killed in battle it is a male, which has no

lasting influence on their number. When they are seeking the means to satisfy their hunger, other animals fly before them, and are pursued, overtaken, and devoured; or should a larger animal not come in their way, they make a repast on the smaller,---beetles, flies, and worms, forming, there is reason to believe, part of their food, as they do of the fox. So entirely are they masters of the forests, that it must be wholly deserted of other animals before they can suffer famine.

The want of the means of subsistence, which Mr. M. contends prevents the increase of the human race, does not prevent the increase of beasts of prey; they are exempt from this check, which rather militates against his theory. But if this be not the check to their increase, where is it to be found? Are they unprolific? Quite the reverse! beasts of prey seldom bring forth fewer than four young in a season. Are they short-lived? No; a lion, even when confined to a cage, in an unfriendly climate, and exposed to cruel treatment, lives many years: the same remark holds good of other beasts of prey.

Reasoning on the principles laid down by Mr. M., we at once conclude that there is a

constant struggle between the principle of increase and the means of subsistence, and that the most powerful and obvious checks cut off their redundant numbers. The population of America is doubled in 25 years, but the principle of increase in beasts of prey is a hundred fold greater, and neither vice, misery, nor moral restraint, in any of the ramifications through which Mr. M. traces them, oppose its progress; it is stationary: some appointment of nature, unconsidered by Mr. M., must, doubtless, be the cause. There are laws which extend their influence through the universe, others are of particular and partial application, of this description are those that relate to the various inhabitants and productions of the earth. In the same forest in which the lion and other beasts hold undisputed sway, and are prolific, the timid deer, a prey to every beast, with only one solitary fawn in a year, are far more numerous than them all.---Making it evident that beasts of prey are not subject to the same checks as herbaceous animals, in what these checks consist, and how they are imposed, I shall attempt to investigate.

Animals that are domesticated, in proportion as they excel in the quickness of their senses, or

in any faculty whatever, are tender and delicate, and difficult to rear: the whelp of a spaniel is in greater danger of dying than a young mastiff; when a high-bred whelp of any description is a few months old, there often appears a greater than natural flow of blood towards the head, the eyes of the animal inflame, it staggers, is dull, and in a few weeks dies; by this disease more than half the young of such animals are cut off, while the common sort escape. This fact, of a greater liability to death in the young of certain descriptions of the canine species, holds good with all animals; for, in all, the cultivation of any property renders the young tender: even poultry have examples of this remark; some breeds of pigeons are never killed, yet they are not numerous; and chickens, of certain descriptions, require more care than others. What is true of domestic animals I feel no difficulty in believing to be so of beasts of prey. In them there appears no room for improvement, all that nature has endowed them with have been in a way of superior excellency: those very properties in which our highly prized dogs excel others, are surpassed in beasts of prey; the least noise, the gentlest touch, the slightest scent, the smallest object, rouse them from sleep,

and they are unwearied in pursuit. To believe that the young of such animals are exposed to the same diseases as are common to dogs that greatly resemble them, is, I think, not taking too much on credit. If we contrast the condition and general circumstances connected with the existence of beasts of prey with such as are attendant on herbaceous animals ranging the same forest, we shall be compelled to acknowledge, that the principle of increase is guided, as it respects them, by different laws: a deer is to every animal a prey, and may be distressed for food by an unkindly season; its fawn is in as great danger as itself, but its senses are dull, it has no character but that of timidity; were it blind, or deaf, or without smell, it would live and grow fat, and bring up its young, as in the perfect enjoyment of its senses; acuteness is not natural to those animals, they are guided to the grass beneath their feet by an unerring instinct, and by it all their wants are satisfied; their young are not difficult to rear, their system is never deranged, their blood never rushes to any particular part to increase its growth or give it greater capacity, and thus expose their health. Whilst a young spaniel depends on its dam for subsistence its senses are blunt like the fawn's,

and few of them die; but they do not long continue in that state: as they grow up they manifest a disposition to obtain food for themselves, and with the disposition they acquire the capacity; their whole system undergoes a change: the old and the young do not, as in the deer, resemble each other: the one has fixed in its constitution a check to the increase of the number of its species, the other requires a check of a different nature.

From the beasts of the forest let us turn our attention to the tenants of the ocean. Fish, in incalculable numbers, glide through its vast extent, balanced in the exactest manner to each other: the number of their spawn are so various, that the proportion they bear to each other seem in danger, in one year, of being destroyed; one fish brings forth a hundred thousand, another only two or three; yet the herring does not increase faster than in its due proportion to the whale, or the cod to the muscle or crab. The principle on which this nice adjustment is regulated, has no relation to vice, misery, or moral restraint; each animal brings forth its full increase, and lives in the enjoyment of the richest abundance: to disease, fish seem almost strangers, few of them ever being seen dead: they

are not too numerous; the ocean is full, but not too full. The climate they most delight in, is always accessible: their senses are far from being acute, nature is required to make no extra effort to fit them for the rank they hold; the young are endowed with the same portion of sensibility as the old: the order of their economy suffers no derangement, knows of no change, has no period of peculiar danger; instinct is unembarrassed by domestication, and leads, without risque, to the supply of their wants: in a word, they suffer no evils but those which are imposed in the directest manner by the hand of nature. And what are these? What are the checks by which the increase of fish, notwithstanding their prodigious fecundity, is prevented? It is in the nature of their subsistence. Fish is the food of fish. The herring, in which the remains of no other animal has ever been found, is perhaps an exception; and there may be others; but, as a general fact, it holds true. The only food presented, and the only appetite given, confines them to this mean of subsistence: their teeth are not adapted to the mastication of vegetables, and in the ocean none grow. The shark is proverbial for its ravenous appetite, but all fish possess the same character;

do we not, in angling, bait with animals to catch the smallest fish? They each seek the life of others, and thus they mutually check their increase.

Should the goodness of God be called in question, and it be asked, how consistent with his benevolence he can create sentient beings to destroy each other? It may be answered, that life is given to animals only for a season, and the mode by which they are compelled to resign it, can be of little consequence.

The elements, as they have been called, of earth, air, fire, and water, were not designed as the means of subsistence. The food of plants is not water, but the remains of any substance that has had life. The food of animals is not earth, but the productions of the earth. Herrings, indeed, appear to live upon the elements, but this conception may arise from our ignorance; they may separate the slime cast off by other fish, and thus subsist.

Had it been the will of the Creator that no more animals should have had existence than could have lived without annoying each other, their number must have been extremely small, and the sum of happiness so inconsiderable, as to render it questionable for what purpose the

world was created. Conceive the ocean tenanted by no more fish than could have lived by the wreck carried into it by the rivers; Mr. Malthus might, in that case, have triumphed in his theory; an end would be at once put to the possibility of increase, and either sterility or destruction must follow. But, as it is, the ocean, through its vast expanse, is inhabited by myriads of beings in the full enjoyment of all the happiness their nature is susceptible of; the sum of their felicity is far greater than if there had only been here and there a solitary animal moving silently along from shore to shore, exciting doubts as to the wisdom of its creation, and grown old without having enjoyed existence. But as the world is now directed every part is full of life; not a stream is without its shoals of fish, which play round each other, in all the frolicsomeness of youth.

Opposed to the happiness thus enjoyed, is the agony of death. It may be said, if there be more pleasure there is also more pain; but what proportion do they bear to each other? The pain of dying is, to animals, a very small drawback on the pleasure of life: it is not dreaded, they know not that they are mortal, and before they discover it they are dead. Life

is a valuable gift, and the more there are that possess it, the greater is the sum of happiness. As death is the lot of all animals, to die suddenly is preferable than to die of disease. A diseased fish must starve, because its prey would escape.

Man has lessened the number and extent of his enjoyments, and reduced his life to a scene of mortification and distress; his death is painful, and his life is full of sorrow: but it is not so with animals, they suffer neither from remorse or imprudence, and consequently are exempt from the great sources of suffering.

In the ocean, the shark lives and reigns the same undisputed sovereign that the lion does in the forest; it knows of no rival, and is subject to no ordinary check. If the number of their young be not great, they are long lived, and must very soon be too numerous were they not prevented; but of the means by which this is accomplished we are ignorant, because the history of that fish is not well known: but thus far we may pronounce, that they are not compelled to be the means of their own destruction, as Mr. M. contends is the lot of man. The infliction of the check to their increase is independent of themselves; the means, whatever

they may be, cannot be avoided, and their end is certain.

On a review of this chapter it will be seen that I contend as strenuously for the necessity of checking the increase of animals as it is possible Mr. M. could do; but of the principles on which it is effected we do not agree. I contend, that they are such as contribute to the happiness of the world; and are so fixed in the nature of animals, and also of the human race, as to operate without exciting a wish that there were fewer sentient beings that the sum of misery might be less. But Mr. M. excites our indignation at the order of nature, and makes thing so much to be dreaded as its laws.

Before I close this chapter, it may not be improper to make a few remarks on the existence of beasts of prey.---The animals they devour are the proper food of man, do they then not lessen the means of his subsistence, and hasten the approach of misery? Certainly not. Beasts of prey, if the expression can be admitted, are the representatives of man; they hold a trust for him, from which they will be dismissed when their services are no longer wanted. The sheep, the deer, and other herbaceous animals, are created for the use of man, and are endowed

with a principle of increase sufficiently strong to admit of many being annually destroyed without the stock being diminished: were not this done, did not many die by violent means, they would soon be too numerous for the subsistence provided for them. The increase of the human race being slow, it was impossible every part of the globe should be occupied before the herbaceous animals would become too numerous; to prevent this, beasts of prey were created, and they range the forest, conscious of their power; but no sooner does man appear, and put in his claim as the rightful lord of the habitable globe, than these animals retire, or shelter themselves by concealment. Herbaceous animals place a sort of confidence in man, but beasts of prey shun him. Foxes still exist in this country, and were the land not inhabited, would be sufficiently public, but now they tremble at being seen. Other animals, especially of the bird tribe, whose lives are equally as much sought after, court our society: a blackbird will build in a garden; a hare or a rabbit do not avoid man as foxes do: these differences in disposition seem to imply the relation that animals stand in to man.

Dr. Priestley supposes that the work of crea-

tion continued through many ages, and did not cease till after the deluge; and that animals received existence as they became useful; and that in this way the stocking the different continents with animals suited to them may be accounted for. The idea struck me as extremely ingenious, and as removing many difficulties; but I would make this addition to it, that, as animals received their existence as their want was felt, so they will be continued no longer than their usefulness remains: consequently, beasts of prey must become extinct as soon as the world is occupied by the human race. Already this process of extinction is begun: bones are found in England, in Siberia, and in America, of a larger size than belong to any animal now living; what these animals were we have no information, but their usefulness was at an end, and they ceased to multiply: that this was the case may be inferred from the want of them not being felt. In a very short time Europe will be as free from all beasts of prey as it is from these larger animals; such as now live are protected for the diversion they afford, a slight effort would destroy them.---To say that beasts of prey are useful in a well-peopled country, is contrary to common observation;

to deny their usefulness in an unpeopled country, implies as little reflection: they are a supplementary part of creation, and must either be domesticated like the dog, or be blotted from the catalogue of living animals.

OF THE

# CHECKS TO THE INCREASE OF THE HUMAN RACE.

SIR Wm. Petty calculated that it was possible, in the present state of the world, for the human race to double in number, by actual increase, in ten years; and the rapidity with which the Jews are known to have multiplied, gives sanction to this opinion: hence it appears, that the whole world might be fully peopled from a single province; and if the principle of increase was to continue in full force after this was completed, it might fairly be asked in what way the superabundant population could be disposed of. I have already said, that the constitution of man was sufficiently strong to carry him forward in the active exercise of his body and mind to the age of 70; and that vice, misery, and moral restraint, were neither natural or necessary to his existence, and would be

withdrawn. But if the principle of increase be too strong, this is impossible; for excess is always productive of evil. A beautiful fabric, carried up too high, is destroyed by its own weight; and too many inhabitants on the globe must suffer from the same cause.

On this view of the subject, which accords with that Mr. Malthus gives, it is not, in the nature of things, that the condition of man should be ameliorated, or his hard lot softened: benefited for a day, placed in the midst of plenty, his increase occasions scarcity. To prevent this evil Mr. M. has mentioned various means, but they are all of them afflictive, cruel, or corrupt, and therefore inapplicable. It is not possible, from the nature and attributes of God, that his creatures should be thus circumstanced by him; to choose between good and evil is honourable and dignified, but to be allowed only a choice of evils, of the most calamitous kind, as the companions and regulators of our lives, is the lowest point of degradation; and were it true, it would be impossible to entertain honorable sentiments of the Deity. But such notions do not require an answer; they are contradicted by experience; the world has received pledge after pledge that it was governed by wisdom and

benevolence. When its population was increasing faster than was consistent with the happiness of man, life was shortened, and is now no longer than the duties connected with it require, and consequently will not be again reduced. This is one pledge which ought to inspire the greatest confidence, and is alone sufficient to satisfy most of my readers, that the population of the earth will never be suffered to increase beyond the means of subsistence: but, as the world is governed by fixed laws, and as no miracle is expected, it becomes us to enquire in what way they are calculated to answer this end.

In order to convey my opinion, it is necessary that I glance at the leading facts in the economy of man, that are connected with the subject.

To increase and multiply, is a command enforced by the most powerful appetite implanted in our nature, and sanctioned by all the endearing relations that sweeten life; marriage is therefore an honorable institution, it is a duty which runs parallel with inclination, and is on this account worthy the consideration of the philosopher and moralist. Such a connection only exists in the relations that arise from this institution; other duties require self-denial, and

have respect to a future good; this combines the present and the future.---Paracelsus was of opinion, that sin was necessary to the propagation of mankind, *(Univ. Hist. v.* 1. *p.* 136): and the writings of the monks and friars abound with strange notions of the utility and virtue of celibacy; what sin had done they would counteract; like Mr. M., they would attempt to assist in the government of the world.---But it becomes us to enquire whether the laws of nature require to be broken, in order that the end for which they were instituted may be answered. This world is a place only of temporary residence, and marriage is the means of keeping up a succession of inhabitants; the institution is of general obligation, but as an indefinite increase is impossible, there must be some appointment for preventing it. Death is that appointment. By death, I do not apprehend to have been intended those horrid forms of it which Mr. M. presents to our view, but a resignation of life when the duties of it are discharged. But the passage from the cradle to the grave is not without its evils; two are expressly appointed,---personal labour, and sorrow in childbirth: to these, others are added by ourselves; such are all that arise from repletion or want, from anxiety of

mind or unnecessary exposure of health. These, and many other, Mr. M. holds over our heads as necessary in the government of the world: but the only thing that concerns us in them is, to shun them. But personal labour, and the agony of death, cannot be avoided; nor is there any other appointment for the continuation of the species than by sorrow. These checks seem very feeble and absolutely insufficient to restrain the principle of population and keep the number of the human race within due bounds. The two latter bear the marks of displeasure; they are punishments grievous in themselves but not destructive of life: the other is the end rather than the means. Something must precede death and render it inevitable, and this we have stated to be a broken constitution: but Mr. M. has proved that death, in the ordinary way in which it is excited, is not equal to the principle of increase, as exemplified in America. In what direction then are we to look for the due balance of the principle of life with the ravages of death, on the ground that misery is unnatural to man, and not a part of his government? We must look to his constitution. Man is not a mere animal; he does not stand in the order of creation as the chief among brutes; he stands apart, holding no

converse with them: he is distinguished by intellectual faculties, to which the body is subject, and to which, in return, it subjects the mind; when the one is tortured with pain, the other raves in delirium; when the mind is dejected and sad, the body is feeble; grief destroys health, and ultimately occasions death. As rational beings we are above the brutes, but as animals we are not; for the mind operates through the medium of the body, which it disorders.

It is unnecessary to say, that brutes are more regular in the production of their young, that the better they live the more fruitful they become, but that the economy of man is not subject to the same laws as animals. It is to the influence that the mind has on the body that I wish to call the attention of my readers, as the "one great cause (to use the words of Mr. M.) intimately united with the nature of man, which, though it has been constantly and powerfully operating since the commencement of society, has been little noticed by the writers who have treated on this subject." As the faculties of the mind are unemployed, as the man sinks down towards the animal, he is prolific; as he ascends above them, his fruitfulness decreases.

Before an investigation of this subject is entered upon, it may not be improper to make a few remarks, which place it at issue with the theory advanced by Mr. M. on an interesting question: Can the condition of man be improved? I am not disposed to advance any Utopian scheme of human perfectibility, but I avow my belief that the time is approaching when the whole world will acknowledge the truth, and be guided by the spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ, which implies a prodigious amelioration in the state of the human race. It enjoins peace: ambition, intemperance, pride, and indolence, the great sources of pestilential and other diseases and famine, are forbidden by its maxims and corrected by its influence. Unwholesome occupations are unnecessary, many being rendered so by improper application. Large towns are unpleasant, and will, in a measure, be abandoned when they present no vicious gratification to tempt the stay of their inhabitants. Excessive labour, bad nursing of children, and every other check of this nature, do not apply to a community of christians, by whom all things are done in order. The theory I advance admits of such an order of things taking place; that advanced by Mr. Malthus is in direct oppo-

sition to it. The checks to population, which he contends are insurmountable, are discountenanced and forbidden by the religion of Jesus Christ; both cannot be true; if Mr. M. can substantiate his doctrines, the christian religion admits of no defence.---But I will go a step further: there are some gentlemen who discredit revelation, yet believe in the being of a God, to these the theory of Mr. M. must also be in opposition. It must meet their ideas, that the world is capable of presenting scenes sufficiently interesting to attract the attention and gratify the noblest feelings of man, were he much wiser and better than he is: it is a theatre on which much may be enjoyed that is not enjoyed. Has the design of God in creation been counteracted? Is the constitution of the world imperfect? Will man never taste in this world the pleasures it was designed to communicate, and which he is capacitated to receive? Certainly he will. There are few intelligent deists who will not join in expressions of the fullest confidence that such a period will come: how many volumes have they not written to hasten its approach: they have spoken much of the possibility of equality, virtue, and good order becoming universal:---the theory of Mr. M. is in

direct opposition to such ideas: but that which is proposed is in unison with revelation, and includes the opinion of the deists; it admits the progress of knowledge, connected with the progress of happiness; it inculcates the practice of virtue, that life may be enjoyed; it limits the number of children, without calling in the aid of the ridiculous notion that celibacy is a virtue of the highest magnitude, a charm by which vice and misery are to be lulled to sleep. On the theory of Mr. M., let man turn to which side he will, misery presents itself; knowledge and virtue can only quicken his sensibility; they can alleviate no evil, they can do him no good.

*The same Subject continued.*

THE relation of the mind to the body is so intimate, yet in its nature so incomprehensible, that all which can be done is to make some advances toward explaining it. A bad piece of intelligence, or any event that depresses the mind, weakens the body, and interrupts the due performance of its functions. Here, then, is an incontestible proof of the relation which subsists, and which should be kept in mind as we go on. If, under circumstances of mental distress, a meal be made, the food does not digest, it is not converted into chyle and assimilated to the body, yet digestion is entirely an animal, or as some would even call it, a chemical process; the food swallowed is, in the ordinary way, acted on in the stomach by a fluid peculiar to it, (the gastric juice), but should the mind be disturbed

this juice is rendered unfit to perform the part natural to it, and the food remains unaltered. A wish will not occasion hunger, but intense thought destroys it; in consequence of the action of the mind the tears flow, the mouth becomes dry, and even the hair changes colour. No secretion is improved by the influence of the mind; on the contrary, the more powerful its operation, the less perfect is the discharge of the functions of the body.

That the influence of the mind extends to the propagation of the species, may, after what has been said, easily be credited, and is supported by facts. All savages are unprolific, and they are so just in proportion as they are entitled to this character; in other terms, as they are fierce, vindictive, and cruel. Bruce noticed this fact, with respect to some of the African tribes; but as we are somewhat better acquainted with the American, I shall particularly notice the circumstances of that people. An American lives in a forest, surrounded by enemies thirsting mutually for revenge; ardent in the pursuit of one object, his mind contemplates that alone, while the scenery around him, and his great ignorance, heightens his malignancy; none of his operations are directed by an enlightened government

inspiring confidence and dispelling care, but he is at once a soldier and a statesman, on whose shoulders the concerns of the nation rest, he thinks and acts as if there were none other; the gravity of the deportment of the whole, their silence, their acute senses, their retentive memories, evince the strong and constant exercise of their minds; their life is that of care. The mind, ever on the rack, is insensible to the soul's calm sunshine. Bound by a savage bond, the members of a tribe direct their joint efforts to the extirpation of their enemies; by this motive, and to this end, all their actions are directed; wealth they disregard, and are insensible to honour, unless it be connected with blood. A life so spent must affect the constitution, the economy of nature is interrupted and broken, the whole system is deranged, and few children are born. But, on the other hand, the American who spends his life in tranquillity, who is free from care, is surrounded by a numerous offspring. Can there be an inference more natural, than, that the number of children depend on the condition of life?

Again,---In civilized society instances are common of a family that promised to be numerous being stopped in its progress by some

circumstance of distress preying on the minds of the parents. It seldom happens that an honest man is a parent in the year in which he becomes a bankrupt.

There is, in this and other countries, a certain class of unhappy persons, in whom virtue is not blended with misfortune, or a stained character the effect of unavoidable circumstances, which still more unequivocally shows the influence of the mind in preventing pregnancy, I mean, that of the prostitute. It is well known that a prostitute is seldom a mother, which is usually attributed to promiscuous intercourse, but this is not the cause: to suppose that a young woman at once leaves the paths of virtue and the protection of her parents for infamy, disease, and want, is as unreasonable as it is unjust; language, offensive to the ear of modesty, is first heard and endured, and afterwards the life by degrees becomes corrupt. At the very outset of a course of vice, whilst perhaps only an individual is a party in the crime, barrenness is almost as common as in the more openly profligate. To state a case: a woman lives with her paramour, the ceremony only of a public acknowledgment is not complied with to constitute them man and wife: No, they stand in

no such a relation; the laws of the country are not observed, for the express purpose that this relationship may never be felt. Theirs is an union of criminal desires, not of honourable motives: the crime constitutes their happiness. Were a law passed, by which such conduct was made to constitute marriage, the principle of their union would be dissolved: the source of such happiness is personal gratification, the source of happiness in marriage is personal worth. The interests of a mistress are centered in herself; abandoned by her own sex, and degraded by the other, the objects of her attention are as limited as those of a savage; and like a savage she spends her days, in fanning a passion, which, the more it reigns the more despicable she becomes, and the more disqualified for being a mother.

That the class of women of which I have been speaking owe their sterility to the influence of their minds, is considerably strengthened by the consideration, that promiscuous intercourse is not of itself a hinderance to pregnancy. At Otaheite, and many other places, where the manners of the people admit of this practice without incurrring disgrace, no check to population follows: they have no proper

sense of shame; their conduct does not appear to them corrupt; their intercourse is precisely that of brutes, and brutes are never sterile because of promiscuous intercourse; it has no injurious effect in the propagation of animals.

In Europe the female character is held in the highest estimation, it is as sacred as life itself; but at Otaheite, or among savages, if virtue has a name, the sentiment is wholly unknown: a sense of decency characterizes civilization. In Europe the female takes alarm at the most distant insinuation, and days of the severest conflict precede and accompany a dissolute life; the mind is never at rest: but the unrestrained manners of an unenlightened people are never checked by reflection. Unrestrained manners in an European are not the mere indulgence of animal instinct, they imply the triumph of depravity over virtue and religion; the struggle is severe: it is the mind that is conquered; it had modelled the face to be an index of itself, the index remains, but the character it expresses is changed: the new aspect given by depravity demonstrates the influence the mind has over the body. If the mind affects the external character, it doubtless biases the constitution.

When Cæsar invaded England, it was common for one woman to marry all the sons of a family; such conduct now would, I have no doubt, be attended with barrenness, because superior information would brand the practice with infamy; but Cæsar does not notice such an effect. The opposite consequences of promiscuous intercourse, in a civilized and a barbarous nation, must have a cause. The unfruitfulness of prostitutes in Europe must originate in some law of nature, and where can we fix it so well as in the influence the mind has on the body? It occasions disease, may it not therefore occasion sterility?

As the nature of the subject does not admit of a full discussion, I shall pass on to the consideration of some less objectionable evidence. That the fact really exists, is incontrovertible: the mind does controul the body, but is the principle of universal application. Does it act uniformly? Does it admit of degrees? Does an increase in knowledge, an exaltation of character, influence in the same manner as the ebullition of passion and the frenzy of dissipation? It does: as the man increases, the animal decreases.

Let us illustrate this idea. Peasants, of

all men, are the freest from care, the freest from mental exercise, and the greatest propagators of their species; neither the revenge or animosity that rankle in the bosom of an American, nor the ardent thirst for knowledge that exhausts the body and drinks up the spirits of a well educated man, are felt by them: they fear not the evils of to-morrow; they have little anxiety for the honour of their families or their country; they pass from day to day, unmoved by ambition and without distress; they are protected by the laws of the state, rewarded by their employers, and contented with their lot, being ignorant of a better: in a word, mental apathy as strongly characterizes this class, as vigilance and anxiety do those of the savage and the philosopher; and just as opposite as they are in the state of their minds, so they are in fruitfulness. The latter can scarcely preserve their names from extinction, the other abounds in children. Ask the Highlander, ask a peasant of any country, whether barrenness be not uncommon? and whether numerous progenies do not in general grace their humble habitations? The general fact is obvious, and forces itself on the attention; but there are no registers that sufficiently discriminate the classes of

society for the purpose of this essay. We must therefore attempt, by some other means, to prove, that the poor are the most prolific class of the community: if this should be effected, it will follow, that some circumstance connected with that station of life, influences fecundity.

The way I shall attempt to prove this fact is, by showing that the lowest class of a civilized nation, of this nation for instance, suffers a greater proportional loss, from the operation of the various evils that afflict society, than any other, without a greater permanent diminution of number. The army and navy are composed wholly of this class, except in their officers, and the annual supply to make good the loss in these vast engines of the state is very considerable. Besides this, the poor fill every department where life is endangered: unwholesome occupations, hazardous enterprizes, all fall to this class. In health they know not its value, in sickness they are deprived of the best means of recovery; individuals rise into the higher classes, but it receives very few from them; it is from the cottage the stream has flown which for several centuries has covered Europe with blood, or been wasted at the shrine of folly. Thus it

appears, that this class sustains a considerable and a constant drain.

Next in rank to the peasant is the ingenious mechanic and the overlooker; and after them, in a few more gradations, the merchant; this valuable class of the community, which, to the honour and happiness of this country, is very numerous, is not distinguished, like the last, for producing more children than are necessary to maintain its number; it suffers no loss, it admits of no drain from it; if an individual be liable to an office of danger, he hires a peasant to fill it. There exists only a few instances of persons, born in the middle rank of life, acting in any other; such will not sink, and they cannot rise: but why can not this class maintain itself, under as great a proportional drain as the other? why is it not as prolific? The cause is, I think, obvious: the life of a tradesman is spent in the vigorous exercise of the powers of his body and mind; he stands on ground somewhat elevated, from whence he may fall; his credit as a merchant, and his happiness as a man, depend on his prosperity; to lose his property, to be unsuccessful in business, and leave his children in worse circumstances than he was left in, is an apprehension that dances

before his eyes like a spectre, and of which he cannot divest himself; to lose his reputation is to him worse than death. Always impressed with this fear, tradesmen speak with despondency of the prospect before them; they are accused of duplicity, but I exculpate them; they are taught, that, to guard against the worst, is to fear it; hence the train of thought commonly indulged. This habitual dread places them in a very different situation to the labourer: the one has what he holds as dear as life poised in a balance, which his utmost care and exertion, in his estimation, can scarcely maintain,---he has climbed a few steps up, and looking down, is filled with dread lest he should fall; the other looks about without emotion, knowing that he cannot sink. This is indeed the most unfavourable part of the picture of the middle station of life, with its cares it has also its comforts; amidst the surrounding gloom a bright cloud bursts out, affording a pleasure to which a servant is a stranger; a secret expectation of success is indulged, which animates the mind and quickens diligence. The poor, compared with them, seem not to promise so many vigorous, well-nursed children, and, in fact, many of them die for want of proper care: but how is the

fact as to the numbers which escape the perils of childhood? Which class has the strongest principle of increase in it? The lower; it suffers, as has been said, by scarcity, by pestilence, and war. If the middle class furnishes a few officers to the army and navy, the number is inconsiderable; besides this, I know of no other demand made on it. But it may be observed, if the middle class is not equally prevented from increasing by the positive checks, it is more so by the preventive: this is at least doubtful. The marriageable age is the same in all ranks; and if a few merchants and tradesmen live in celibacy, many of the lower class do the same.--- It may be again observed, that if neither the positive nor preventive checks very much break in upon and interrupt the increase of the middle orders of the community, that this end is accomplished by many of them sinking into the lower, or rising into the higher: ascent is possible but difficult, and but few succeed in the attempt; to descend seems more common, but it is a forbidden path, and less frequented than is supposed. A person who has acquired wealth commonly educates his children and fits them for the enjoyment of it, which precludes them from ever sinking. An educated person cannot

become a peasant, in the temper of his mind; he may be depraved, the pest of society, and the grief of his friends; he may become a soldier, or may meanly live on charity, but he cannot become a peasant. Would he submit to their labour his education would instantly place him above them. Their station has no charms to invite, no power to constrain; education has broken its fetters; a loss of property does not constitute a loss of rank, the money may be gone, but the station remains. Like citizens of Rome, under no circumstances do they give up their birthright. A Roman soldier was accustomed to labour in the highways of the country he had assisted to conquer, but this did not put him on an equality with the barbarian that was doing the same work; it was to the Roman a work of necessity, and therefore he did it chearfully, but his proper station was in the camp, which he always bore in mind; but the barbarian was fit for no other employment, he did what was imposed without further motive: the difference between a Roman soldier and a barbarian is the same as exists between an educated and an uneducated family. Whatever the members of the first may

be compelled to do, they have a view to their proper rank in life; but the other works to supply the wants of the day, and is satisfied when that is accomplished.

A family may possess wealth without their minds being elevated above their servants; such a family are peasants. The middle class are a little republic, whose members respect and honor each other; should the child of any want a protector, some one stretches out his arm, and bears him above his difficulties, and, in return, he perhaps does the same to the children of his benefactor, for money is ever changing hands. Should this point be allowed; should it be granted that few sink into the lower, or rise into the higher classes, it follows, that the middle order produces no surplus of population; it cannot support a constant call for men to be employed in the service of the state, or in any other way foreign to the wants of the class: it is just able to keep up its own population. Thus we find a large part of the community that does not require the operation of vice, misery, or moral restraint, to prevent its increase; and what is true of a part may be so of the whole.

If the middle class only maintains itself, the

next above it still more clearly manifests that vice and misery are only accidental and voluntary checks to population. It is a familiar fact, that the higher class is unproductive: but the important part of the fact is, that this circumstance is limited to civilized nations; it extends no further than where superiority in rank implies superior information. The chiefs of a nation of shepherds are not unprolific; in all nations in that state, or even advanced a step further, genealogies reaching down many centuries are common. "I cannot help remarking it," says Dr. Smith, "that very old families, such as have possessed some considerable estate from father to son for many successive generations, are very rare in commercial countries. In countries which have little commerce, on the contrary, such as Wales or the Highlands of Scotland, they are very common. The Arabian historians seem to be all full of genealogies: and there is a history, written by a Tartar, Kham, which has been translated into several European languages, and which contains scarce any thing else: a proof that ancient families are very common among those nations." *Wealth of Nations*, *v.* 2, *p.* 129.

Such authority, for the general fact, may be

considered as conclusive, but the reasoning admits of doubt: the change of property, in a commercial country, is certainly frequent; but it is not wholly in consequence of the rise and fall of fortunes which commerce gives birth to. Athens was not a commercial city, nor Berne, and yet old families were rare. The nobility of this kingdom are above the influence of commerce, yet they cannot boast of estates being many centuries in their families. It is not from commerce only that such events originate; they must have another cause. A commercial country is always civilized; commerce is in part the cause and the consequence of civilization, but the uncertainty that attends it is not the sole occasion of the frequent changes of property. Estates made hereditary often want an heir, and this I apprehend to be the principal reason that families hold large estates for so short a time. Those who enjoy any rank in a civilized country, who stand at its head, either in intellect or in power, stretch their capacity to the utmost, that they may acquit themselves with credit in the stations they fill: this exertion of the mind is, in the view I take of the subject, the efficient cause of the few generations an estate is enjoyed

by such a family, or rather that such a family exists to possess it.

In days of less refinement, bodily strength was deemed the most valuable quality that could be possessed by the warrior or the gentleman: the weight of armour worn, and the nature of the contest frequently engaged in, required great strength. The story of Goliah, the Philistine, gives a just idea of the value set on personal strength by that warlike nation: what is highly prized, is attentively cultivated. During the reign of the Edwards, the barons were the finest men in this nation; a taste for personal size became general, and those who lived on the substantial fare of those days, and worked little, were most likely to excel. This taste is handed down to the present day, size is still esteemed a part of manly beauty, and in proportion as this prevails the mind is neglected; indeed it is of comparatively little value, when honour or favour depends on something independent of it. A short but well proportioned stature is commonly accompanied by a vigorous constitution and an active mind; and is held in more respect than formerly, because the ardour for a military life is abated, and has rendered size of less utility.---The Grecian statues of gods

and heroes are tall and commanding, because the office assigned them required strength; but in mere matters of taste, as in representing a female, their figures commonly are small: had they not considered height as betokening usefulness rather than beauty, they would certainly not have omitted it in their statues designed as models of beauty.

The man who has to labour may boast of strength, but he whose life is spent in study would be ridiculous so to boast. The baron who was a farmer, among farmers, ate, drank, and slept much, and grew to a great size; but a new order of things has taken place, and those who delighted in managing the lance and the spear now constitute the senate of a great nation. While they were mere farmers, genealogies were common; they then thought but little; but now the complex affairs of government require profound thought and unwearied application: to them, courage and size are neither necessary nor desirable: it is for them to deliberate, not to act. When the concerns of the state do not demand their immediate attention, their minds are still occupied; they have some interest to serve, some point to gain: they are the servants of the public, but are not required to risque

their persons: personal courage, as applicable to them, is what Gibbon represents it to be, "a vile and vulgar qualification."

The distinction between the baron of the present and of former days, consists wholly in the object of pursuit: they are alike exempt from the dread of want, and the consequences of it; they know but little of the various evils that thin the families of peasants. But at one period the baron's table is surrounded by a numerous progeny, at another scarcely a seat is filled. This circumstance points to some cause, and I know of no other, than the different effect of a tranquil, thoughtless life, and a life spent in anxiety and care.

There are many estates enjoyed by families that possessed them at the Norman conquest, but such families have never risen to greatness; they have not given birth to genius: it is in vain to enquire of them the improvements made even in agriculture, or of such as it is desirable should be made: they are men of precedents, not men of thought: the maxims of their ancestors guide them: they are useful in peopling a country, but not in civilizing it. Philosophers and poets, men of science or of taste, are not of this order; those who flourished a

few generations back, live only in their works, their families are extinct. But it may be said, if this be the case, knowledge is a great evil, and the bulk of the people can never be informed.---This remark will be attended to in another place; all I aim at, at present, is to establish the fact, that the most thoughtful people, taken as a body, are the least prolific; by thoughtful, I mean any violent exercise of the mind, whether it be of a savage or a philosopher.

Although this subject, from the nature of it, appears entirely confined to the human race, yet its principles are founded in the laws of nature, and may be supported by analogy. A hare, under the protection of a park, breeds earlier in the year, and yields more young in a season, than one that has been subject to perpetual alarm; the food of both may be abundant, but the timidity of the animal stifles the voice of nature. A mare, that ranges undisturbed over a barren pasture, brings forth its foal every season; but the same mare, well fed in a stable, and trained to the chace, is wholly unproductive. An elephant, caught at the earliest period of its life, and domesticated, and treated in a way apparently agree-

able to it, never brings forth young. The same may be said of most species of birds; if they are allowed a large room to fly in, and live on the food they are most fond of, yet they never build a nest. These facts are sufficient to show, that an increase of animal life depends on something more than animal passion, or the abounding of the means of subsistence.

## OF FECUNDITY.

IT has been remarked, in the foregoing chapter, that various classes of the same nation are unequal contributors to its population. This fact Mr. Malthus never appears to have considered; but being assured that the Americans doubled their numbers by actual increase in 25 years, has taken it for granted that this rate is natural to every country.----It is further remarked by our author, that the passion between the sexes is every where so similar, that it may be considered, in algebraic language, as a given quantity: this may be true, but the resemblance holds good no further: an equality of affection does not ensure an equal number of children.

"In Petersburg, one marriage yields 4 children;---in the government of Moscow, 3;---in the town of Tobolsk, from 1768 to 1778,

3; from 1779 to 1783, 5; in 1783, 6."*---In England, Mr. M. calculates, that each marriage yields about 5½ births.† In the parish of Duthil, in Scotland, each marriage yields 7 children;‡ and this does not appear much to exceed the average for the whole country.

Opposed to this great fecundity are all barbarous states: a marriage of North American Indians, or unlettered Africans, very rarely yields above 3 children. It is unnecessary to multiply facts of this description: it is a familiar truth, that the number of children a marriage yields is not the same in every country, nor in every village; consequently, the rate of increase cannot be the same in every place. This difference does not arise from accidental circumstances, but may be made the subject of previous calculation.---Bruce, Park, Charlevoix, Ulloa, and many other writers, speak of the small families that are met with in barbarous countries. The fact is of general application: but, change the circumstances of the people, let those who used to wander through the woods and fastnesses of their coun-

* Malthus's Essays, pa. 211. † Pa. 315. ‡ Pa. 327.

try, burning with revenge, become farmers, their families invariably betoken the change by an increase in number. The American tribes, that scarcely produced children to supply the places of those who died, on forming alliances with other tribes, or by any other means becoming more tranquil and secure, have increased in the number of births to a marriage. The Mohawks, now settled in Canada, were formerly as unprolific as other savages, but now their huts abound with children equally so with European peasants.

A hundred and fifty years before America was discovered by the Spaniards, we are informed, that the southern part of that continent was as little civilized as the northern: but the Incas making some discoveries in agriculture, taught them to the people, and effected a change in their habits; immediately an increase in population commenced, and when the Spaniards gained a footing in that country, it was well peopled. The Incas did not banish the checks to population that had previously existed; a little civilization rather increases than diminishes their force, by placing the people in situations, the evils of what they have not learned to avoid; but they rendered

the people more happy, and they became more prolific.

The history of the world is replete with such instances; I shall only mention one other: I mean that which is afforded by colonies. It seldom happens that colonies are founded, except by such nations as are in an advanced stage of civilization; one object is, to draw from the mother country the discontented, the turbulent, and the vicious: the romantic notions of some individuals, and the lost character of others, render them as willing to embark as the mother country is to direct their destination: the worthy and respectable may be driven from a country, but I am here speaking of those who are always prepared for such an enterprise; those who have wasted their health in disquietude, and stained their character by their conduct, the more profligate of whom fall under the sentence of the law, and go in chains to the place of their destination: such are not supposed to have large families. The children that have a claim to the care of the Philantrophic Society are not numerous. The profligate are not prolific: by profligate, I do not mean the drunkard or the sensualist merely, but the person who unites to these vices a

malignancy of temper. These very persons, when removed to a remote colony, where every object that once engaged their attention and contributed to form their character is withdrawn, where no diversity of pursuit, no daring schemes, attract their attention, insensibly approximate, however opposite they may have been: like members of a family, they acquire a resemblance, and feel a common interest; the same dangers surround them, and the same reward is promised: as they have no variety of pursuits, so they have no inequality of condition; here those who knew no bound to their extravagance, their ambition, or their caprice, sink into the rank of peasants.---The savage, and the corrupt members of a civilized country, are not far remote: by removing, in part, the ignorance of the one, and the vice of the other, we find them still approximating; they are a few removes from barbarism, to which state all colonists are reduced: no office is now too mean for men that once were proud, for that which is necessary loses its meanness. The mother country protects, but does not feed them; the task of procuring the means of subsistence devolves on themselves, and their health is promoted by the labour. The very persons

who, in their native country, would scarcely have left a child to bear their dishonoured name, in exile lay the foundation of states and empires.

"The Greek colonies of Syracuse and Agrigentum in Sicily, Tarentum and Locri in Italy, Ephesus and Miletus in Lesser Asia, in the course of one or two centuries, rivalled, and even surpassed in numbers, their mother country." *Smith's Wealth of Nations, v. 2. p.* 360. The mother country was doubtless as well supplied with the means of subsistence as her colonies, and suffered as little from any of the checks to population which Mr. Malthus speaks of: the great difference appears to have been, that the strife for excellency, so much felt in Greece, was not in like manner felt by her colonies. The colonists became inferior characters; the same spirit of ambition did not fire their minds: their vices may have been as gross, without being as daring: they occupied a more extensive country, and consequently their pursuits were as different as their fecundity appears to have been.

The European colonies in America, are an additional evidence of the rapid increase of a people planted in a new soil, and pursuing new

customs. They are part of ourselves, our brethren, their history is familiar to us, their growth we have witnessed; but how does it happen that a divided family increases faster in one part than another? Is Europe less healthy than America? Can the means of subsistence not be as certainly procured in England as in Pennsylvania? It is not that America is more blessed than Europe that her population increases faster; our American brethren are farmers, not philosophers; they do not shine in literature or in science; the principle of increase is not lessened by care and anxiety, by the fervor of passion or the fretfulness of discontent. The present inhabitants of America will, in a few centuries, people that continent: but the rate will not continue to be as it is now, it will diminish in proportion as the mental faculties are exerted.

A colony has lately been settled in New South Wales, by accounts received, the number of children is already considerable, and the population of the island may be expected to advance rapidly: there are a few natives scattered over it, who have long had possession, but they have not peopled the island, Mr. Malthus says, because they are deficient in the means of subsistence: but habitual want is, I apprehend, no

where experienced; it does not, in any barbarous country, lessen the number of marriages; and we do not read of those who are born being starved to death in greater proportion than in civilized states: as to the other checks to which they may have been exposed, strangers are as liable to experience them as themselves, and yet strangers, we are informed, are rapidly multiplying. Is there not a difference in the fecundity of the women? No people averse to personal labour are fruitful in children: the savage and the highly civilized are alike in this respect: even Mr. M. has been betrayed into an acknowledgment that rank affects fecundity. "The substitution," he says, "of a more quiet and sedentary life, for a life of perpetual wandering and hardship, would immediately render the women more prolific."* This remark, which is all I am labouring to establish, destroys our author's strong assertion, "That the main principle advanced (by him) is so incontrovertible, that had he confined himself to general views, he could have intrenched himself in an inpregnable fortress."† If a principle exist, that is able to check the increase of population by

* Malthus's Essays, pa. 39. † Pa. 6.

lessening fecundity, our author is not in a fortress at all.

The next object that claims our attention is, a nation advanced to the highest pitch of refinement. The mind here is involuntarily drawn towards Greece; a people, among whom marriage was honorable, and barrenness a reproach: they abounded in all the comforts and accommodations of life. But Gibbon informs us, that the Athenians, in the best days of their republic, sunk from 30 to 21000. *Decl. and Fall of Rom. Emp. v.* 1, *p.* 54.---Was not the civilization they had attained a check to their increase? Were they not (as a people somewhat similar in their pursuits to the higher classes of this country? As the subject is intitled, from its interest, to every description of illustration, let us descend from general to particular facts, and contrast the increase of the peasantry, with that of the opulent, the learned, and the noble, of our own nation.

The poor have long remarked, that, amidst all their misery, they had the most numerous families to support: We have the mouths, and they the bread, is become a proverb. But the higher orders are far removed from misery, and do not suffer more from vice, or moral restraint,

than the poorest of their brethren of mankind; but where is their increase? The most noble families in succession become extinct; there is not, in many instances, an heir to bear down to posterity the name, or to wear the laurels that were nobly gained. How many peers can count back three centuries of noble ancestors; and the few who can count back this far, include a long period when their name only lived; having sought to be obscure; they have not wanted an heir; they were then farmers in the midst of farmers, and in that state genealogies alone are to be sought for.

The Roman family of which Nero was a member, reckoned a long succession of worthless characters; and other families might be mentioned, more honourable, but equally ancient: but they are an exception to a general fact, the cause of which will, in another place, be hinted at.

In the history of our own, or any other civilized nation, we have to lament that the family which interests us in one page, in turning over a few more, we are told is extinct. Where are the names that flourished, and were honourable, 500 years ago? Do they live but in history? Being elevated above the evils that

destroy the poor, they ought, on Mr. M's. theory, to pervade every corner of the land; and the families that at the Norman conquest were the most conspicuous by their rank, ought now to be the most numerous. A name associated with greatness is too much esteemed to be disowned or exchanged. The name of Plantagenet has not been abandoned and the name Broom substituted; the meaning is the same, but who would make the exchange? The names most common in this country are evidently modern; such as Tailor, Carpenter, Wheelwright, &c. A peasant used to be known by the name of the farm on which he lived, and by his father's given name; Thomas, the son of John, of Hyde-hall, was all the address that was necessary; but afterwards the name of the occupation was assumed. If many names have not been exchanged, many families have become extinct, and in many instances this fact can be verified.

To ennoble a family, is to plant it in a soil in which it will not thrive. Were there not a successive creation of peerages, the very name of nobleman would cease. Peers are not cut off by the checks that Mr. M. publishes to the world: they do not live in celibacy: their distinguished rank, the honourable means by which

it has, in many instances, been obtained, the great property and personal interest attached to it, are all objects of too high consideration not to excite a desire to continue them. By continuing the family, consequently few peers, or the relations of peers, die unmarried. If celibacy be not the cause, is it their dissipated lives? It has already been said, that personal vice does not greatly retard an increase in population; and, besides, the higher classes are not so dissipated as the lower, who live in towns. If a few individuals, whose education has been neglected, forget the character they ought to maintain, and join to a weak and ill-informed mind an infamous conduct, even in this there is not that grossness so destructive of health into which many of the common people plunge themselves. The parade and show attached to families of rank, give the air of dissipation without the crime. If, as strict moralists, they unhappily cannot be pointed out as examples worthy of imitation, they do not, except in a few instances, destroy their lives by dissipation: the servants are commonly more grossly immoral than their masters, but their fruitfulness is not lessened.

Education enlarges the sphere of enjoyment,

and diversifies its pursuits; the ignorant alone seek pleasure in excess. The educated voluptuary takes for his motto the sentiments of St. Evremont: "Vice without dissipation, virtue without austerity." However mean and degrading such maxims are as rules of conduct, they are calculated to preserve health, and do not abridge the principle of increase; and, I believe, are not a little acted on.

Besides being at least as equally exempt from the checks just mentioned, the higher classes do not fear famine, or dread pestilence, and their lives are longer than the most numerous class of their fellow-subjects. Taking all these circumstances together, it can scarcely be denied, that the common people are the most prolific.

Not only is the fecundity of women extremely various as it respects different nations, and different classes of the same nation, but some years are more favourable to population than others. Sir Wm. Petty observes, that the year in which most die, fewest are born, and *vice versa*. *Polit. Arith. p.* 59. And by referring to the table of Susmilch, we find, that even the average of five years marks a considerable disproportion: from the year 1721 to 1726, there were born 21452 children; in the succeed-

ing five years, there were born 29554. Other periods show as great a difference.

That a greater or less fecundity is not the creature of accidental causes only, but that part of the economy of nature by which the population of the globe is regulated, and in consequence of which no country can ever be overpeopled, is, I think, made evident.---This view of the subject dissipates care as to the means of subsistence, and makes human life appear too valuable to be the sport of the passions, or the plaything of statesmen.

# OF STERILITY.

THE human body has often been compared to a machine, every part of which is essential to the whole; but this comparison falls vastly short of conveying an adequate idea of the complex operations on which health depends. The lungs, the kidnies, the skin, perform each their part, independently of the other, but are still connected. But this is not all; while these organs are performing their functions with great regularity, and one day succeeds another without any apparent alteration, the whole system is changing in the relation of its parts. The child imperceptibly becomes an adult, and then as insensibly sinks into decrepitude. Evolutions are established which require various times for their performance, and which succeed each other as life advances. A child is soon exhausted and as soon

refreshed: the tender thread on which life hangs will not bear to be extended to the length readily admitted in later years; it performs a shorter evolution: in the morning we are not the same as at night; the system has undergone a change, it has performed a diurnal evolution. Besides which, there are many other evolutions; some that require a week, others a month, and some that require several years: the due performance of which are not absolutely essential to life, but they are highly important as they respect the continuance of the species.

A machine, thus complex, is soon injured, and false motions are established: a fit of sickness has been observed to commence on a certain day successively for many years; this is especially the case with the gout; it is not the accident of an hour, but the preparation of an year; it is an evolution performed; there has been a continued motion through the whole period towards this point, which is reached at a given time. What is true of the gout, is true also of many other diseases, and of the whole economy of life: hunger, thirst, fatigue, are none of them the creatures of a moment: something precedes them.

Let us apply these facts to the subject be-

fore us. No woman is always susceptible of pregnancy, there must first be a predisposition in the constitution, brought about by the co-operation of many evolutions ; these may be interrupted, and many interruptions constitute barrenness ; and when not interrupted they require a considerable length of time for their accomplishment. After the birth of one child, nature demands time to prepare for a second ; the system must undergo a determined change, and unless this happens, barrenness is the consequence. Pregnancy is not optional ; it is not certain. A female, susceptible of pregnancy to day, may not be so tomorrow : many events, that strongly affect the mind, may occur and prevent it ; or the undisturbed operation of nature may pass the period by, as in brutes. Childhood and old age are inevitably unprolific ; and, after childbearing has commenced, most women are subject to very considerable periods of sterility. Some bear a child every seven, others every fourteen years, and others have only one child in a whole life. Thus for 6 years together, and for 13 years together, these females were not susceptible of pregnancy ; as in the distant periods at which sickness occurs, the constitution was, in the

whole intermediate space, making advances towards it; but then only it was mature. I knew a young lady whose mother married at 18, and after living several years with her husband, the marriage was dissolved by his death; she married a second time, and after this marriage had subsisted some years, at the age of 45 became a mother. It is not improbable, would the female economy have allowed it, that at another long distance of time another child might have been born; a predisposition to pregnancy being first requisite to its taking place. This predisposition may be forwarded or retarded by circumstances; such as anxiety, indisposition, great susceptibility of temper, and a variety of other causes which it is unnecessary to mention; my sole design being to prove the general fact, that pregnancy is dependent on a certain state of the system, and that the system is influenced by external causes.

It is not only requisite, in order to pregnancy, that the female economy be disposed towards it, but there must also be a certain adaptation in the married pair. There is a striking illustration of this fact in the youths of Georgia and Circassia: their beauty is proverbial; being exposed to sale in the

Turkish markets, the females are purchased by most of the licentious courts in Asia: the Persian nobles especially, who are of Tartar origin, and remarkably ugly, purchase and marry Circassians that their children may not inherit their ugliness. The practice is common, and as no mention has been made of their being unfruitful, it may be concluded they are not so. But the boys, who are chiefly purchased by the government, and sent into Egypt to be trained up for the service of the state as mamelukes, are invariably unproductive: if, by a connection with an Egyptian, as a very rare circumstance, one of them becomes a parent, the race invariably stops; no instance having ever been known of such a child continuing the species. In Circassia and Georgia there is no deficiency of children, but, married to Egyptians, there is a total want of offspring: this fact has the testimony of Raynal, Volney, and all other writers on the population of Egypt. What can have given rise to this singular fact, if the circumstance for which I have produced it in illustration has not?

When Egypt was the mart of the Roman empire, merchants of every country took up their abode in her cities; and dying, left children

who melted into the common mass of citizens; by associating they became assimilated in their manners, their principles, and their dispositions, and their marriages were fruitful. Not a hint is given, that I am acquainted with, that the marriage of a citizen of any province of the Roman empire with an Egyptian, was as certainly unproductive as if they had been of distinct species.

The Egyptians do not now bear the relation to other nations they once did; the principle of increase is circumscribed; a sameness of constitution between them and foreigners no longer exists. The circumstances of their lives have continued a resemblance in constitution among themselves, and therefore the race is kept up; but as it respects the inhabitants of happier regions, the resemblance is gone. Does it not hence appear, that fecundity is influenced by external circumstances, and that a certain adaptation in the married pair is necessary? No miracle has been wrought, no law of nature has been broken, the same causes which have produced these effects in Egypt, produces them elsewhere. It is an axiom of universal application, that a want of similarity in the condition and habits of life, produces that want of adapta-

tion of constitution, which is the cause of many unfruitful marriages.

Distinguished characters are seldom very prolific; nor are foreigners so much so as persons of the same nation. I have repeatedly been informed, that Europeans settled in the East-Indies have fewer children than are common where both parties are Indians: and there is reason, independently of the veracity of the gentlemen from whom I had the information, to credit the account. For instance, creoles in Bengal are less numerous than at Jamaica, although they are better treated: the father of a creole, in the East, would think it infamous to abandon his child; but in the West, such children are disowned and dishonoured, they seldom know a father's care. Slavery is truly degrading, if a father abandons his child because it is born in that state. In some of the islands in the eastern ocean, the habits of the people more resemble those of Europeans, and I am informed they are more prolific. The intercourse of Europeans with the natives of Africa is perhaps equally as great as with the East-Indians, and the number of children of colour is greater, but when it is considered how little the persons of these unprotected females are respected, the number of their

children is still extremely small. How few creoles are there in the whole of the West-India islands, but it may be observed that slavery has so unfriendly an influence on health, that marriages are unproductive with natives of the same country: whatever force there may be in this remark, it does not remove the difficulty. On the continent of Africa, where ill health cannot be pleaded, and where Europeans are constantly living with the natives, children are very seldom the consequence. A gentleman, who had been attached to the Sierra Leone Company, informed me, that after residing several months in Africa he had only seen two creoles. The Africans are not as entirely unproductive with foreigners as the Egyptians, but there is an evident resemblance.

But it is unnecessary to specify particular countries, the fact is general; every shore to which the ocean can bear a ship is crowded with foreigners; and those who are best acquainted with the character of sailors know, that to many of them delicacy is unknown, and decency but little understood: few voyages are published in which an allusion is not made to the licentiousness of the crew. In many such countries there are no prostitutes, in the sense in which we use

the term, for licentiousness is without reproach. But whatever the nature of the intercourse may be, in no region of the globe are there many children allied in blood to Europeans. Neither at Otaheite nor at Hudson's Bay, neither among the aborigines of America nor the dark natives of Africa is a mixture of blood often to be found. There is, however, one exception to this remark, at the Cape of Good Hope there are many bastard Hottentots; a proof that Hottentots are more assimilated to Europeans than at all times is willingly allowed.

If it be admitted that the intercourse which commerce has established between remote nations has in very few instances been the occasion of uniting them in blood, some cause is naturally enquired after; and the want of constitutional similarity, produced by a diversity of habits and manners, appears to me to be that cause. As facts that are under our immediate observation are more satisfactory than those with which we are acquainted only by report, let us enquire whether a diversity of pursuits and interests in a married pair of the same nation have any influence over their fruitfulness.

It has already been observed, that any powerful and long continued exercise of the mind

that inflames the passions, or that in any way subjects the body to the mind, occasions barrenness, as is particularly exemplified in prostitutes; but in the most honourable exercises of the mind the body also suffers. Women who marry late in life, and whose habits are consequently formed, especially if they have been actively engaged in the management of any concern beyond the range of domestic affairs, commonly have few children. I have frequently observed, that the first years of the marriage of persons whose pursuits in life had called forth the powers of their minds, even when youth was not yet passed, were unproductive; but after a common interest had assimilated their constitutions, a want of offspring had no longer been lamented. The circumstance in some cases is occasioned by physical causes; it is a period of barrenness, but I apprehend it is not so in all. Instances of sterility are more common among a civilized people than among a nation of shepherds. Fecundity is independent of passion, the principle is different, passion commences earlier and continues longer than the period of fruitfulness. I might here avail myself of the high authorities of Dr. Darwin and Dr. Heberden, but the subject does not

admit a fuller discussion. Those marriages are in general the most fruitful, taking the station of life into consideration, that are most tranquil. Hence agriculture is friendly to population, it admits of little display of character, no circumstance fires the mind with emulation, or stirs up the passions till their rage consumes the health, or gives a new bias to the constitution; such characters would be unfit for farmers.

Barrenness is not only occasioned by certain evolutions of the system being interrupted, or from a want of a proper adaptation in the married pair, but also from actual disease. But of this I shall say nothing. It is sufficient if it has been proved, that the fecundity of women in a great measure depends on the state of civilization to which they may have attained, and that by knowing the civilization a calculation may be made of the rate of increase.

OF

# HEREDITARY DISEASES.

HEREDITARY diseases do not naturally and necessarily attend the human race. Leprosy, madness, gout, scrofula, sprung out of certain habits and practices; they were all acquired, and probably will be eradicated. Leprosy, originating in the want of personal cleanliness, has already given way to the improvements which have taken place in that respect: linen is now substituted for woollen in many articles of dress, and other regulations equally friendly to cleanliness, have caused leprosy almost to disappear. Madness is an increasing malady; it has its origin in anxiety, or it is the consequence of other diseases; it is sometimes wholly recovered from, but unfortunately a tainted constitution propagates its like, and no means have hitherto been discovered to prevent it. Celibacy is a

virtue in persons whose progenitors have been thus afflicted: and even when it does not reach as far as madness it may give a peculiarity of character and talent. I have sometimes enquired into the family history of youths of extreme dissipation, and so often have found some part of the family at one period or other afflicted with madness, that I now seldom pass my judgment of such characters till I am first assured they are moral agents. I have little doubt that madness is the cause of more vice than is imagined. The subject merits the attention of moralists. What parent can answer for the conduct of his child if this be the case? for education is but a feeble check to the slightest madness. Madness is an evil so various in its mode of operation, so difficult to remove, so distressing in all its branches, that it ought to be a subject of general care that it does not spread: as it had an origin, it may also have a remedy; if this be not discovered, the families that are afflicted must become extinct, for the world cannot be moralized so long as madness exists.---The gout is not a disease of the poor, and need not be of the rich; it enters a family, or leaves it, at pleasure.---The scrofula is the offspring of a cold

and fickle climate: the plan adopted in many families from the advice of Locke, of attempting to make the children hardy, by thin clothing and spare diet, has in many instances given birth to this malady; it makes its appearance at the close of winter and is suspended by the warmth of summer. As soon as the malady is noticed, recourse is had to the liberal use of wine, and by this means the external appearance of the disease is occasionally removed; but may it not be doubted whether consumption has not sometimes had its origin in this practice? would it not be more advisable to clothe and lodge children warm, to keep them on nutritious diet, and at the age of 10 or 12 gradually to give up this plan, and substitute a diet sufficiently nutritious but less stimulant? By this means the disease is combated before it has disturbed the system; the constitution is strengthened, consumption is guarded against, and injurious habits are prevented. A scrofulous family is always consumptive. Should a young person have been drinking freely of wine to repel any external mark that may appear, and should symptoms of consumption take place, instantly wine and bark, and those remedies calculated to remove scrofula, are abandoned for milk and

vegetables. Plans so opposite cannot be proper. That any regulations in diet will eradicate the disease I do not expect, but a better acquaintance with the properties and influence of the climate, as the cause of the malady, which the active spirit of research of the present day warrants the expectation of, may lead to other and more effectual remedies.

I have dwelt thus long on this subject for the sake of pointing out these diseases as not being necessarily connected with the constitution of man.

Contrary to what might have been expected, hereditary diseases are great promoters of population; the world is considerably more full in consequence of their existence. The Jews, through whose veins leprosy flowed, increased faster than any other nation is said to have done. In a few districts in the north of Europe, scrofula prevails as much as leprosy did among the Jews, and children are as numerous. Particular families, subject to either of these diseases, are commonly very prolific; it counteracts, in a considerable measure, the influence of those causes that have a tendency to occasion sterility, and keeps in existence names that would otherwise have been extinct.

The gout may be acquired in any country, and becomes hereditary; but in cold climates it is most frequent and most severe. The Spaniards, afflicted with this disease, frequently remove to Mexico, as I have been informed, and find some mitigation of their suffering in the warmth of the climate. The Greeks were not unacquainted with the gout, and their opinion accorded with ours, that devotion to Bacchus at once gave birth to the malady, and disposed the martyr to a continuation of homage. Families that possess hereditary gout are seldom childless.

Madness is a disease not altogether of the same nature as those just mentioned; it respects the connection of the mind with the body: and I have not sufficient knowledge of the subject to advance a confident opinion respecting its influence on fecundity.

From the above facts and observations, it is evident that certain diseases so far influence the body as to be propagated, which could not happen if the principle of increase was, as Mr. Malthus intimates, a given quantity: that which is liable to alteration may be increased or diminished. Hereditary diseases, experience teaches, hasten those evolutions in the system

that are necessary to pregnancy. If six children be as many as a marriage of sound and healthy persons usually yields, eight is not a larger proportion for those who are diseased. I would not be meant to imply, that all numerous families are infected with disease, that is not the case; but I do contend, that an unsound constitution, in a civilized country, most commonly proves prolific.

## GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

IF the remarks in the preceding chapter be true, it is impossible that the world should ever be fully peopled by men of similar constitutions to the nobility of this country, nor can it ever be filled by savages, nor is a society very much mixed, agreeable to our notion of excellency.

Without enquiring minutely into any stage of civilization, I think it may be taken as a general fact, that a state increases in population in proportion as it becomes civilized; by civilization, I do not mean effeminacy or dissipation, but an increase in knowledge and happiness. It may appear singular, that I mention knowledge as necessary to a full population, when I have stated in another place, that the exercise of the mental faculties lessens the principle of increase; but this difficulty is easily ments, become more simple in their manners,

removed. The great bulk of mankind acquire wisdom by instruction from others, without much exertion on their part. The farmer, who bears the same rank in society his ancestors did a thousand years ago, is not like them in manners or in information, notwithstanding his rigid adherence to their maxims; the great body of the people having gone forward, he has imperceptibly moved with them; he is just above his labourers, his ancestors were the same: knowledge acquired in this way calls for no labour, produces no anxiety, but still it elevates the mind, refines the passions, and when it has made any considerable advances, it lessens the principle of increase. To benefit by the labours of others is easy, but the statesmen and philosophers, by whose incessant care and attention advances in civilization have been made, spent their lives in anxious solicitude; they gained knowledge by intense thought, and the end has been, the extinction of their families. A middle line here may easily be conceived. It may be conceived that the lower classes may gain in knowledge and refined sentiment, and that the higher classes may lose part of their inordinate ambition and restless love of fame, and, without any diminution in their useful acquire-

more uniform in the temper of their minds, and more prolific; and thus a state of society be produced, in which the births and deaths shall equal each other.

But that nothing may be left to conjecture, I appeal to the history of the world, and I say, that in every age the fullest peopled states have increased the slowest, not because vice and misery have more abounded, but because the principle of increase has been lessened. China has, for many ages been of this number, and when its population became stationary its civilization did not advance; there has been a correspondence between the state of population and that of civilization. China is an agricultural country, large cities are not more in proportion than in France; war, famine, and pestilence, are even less experienced, and celibacy is contrary to the manners of the people; every circumstance, on Mr. Malthus's theory, promises the most rapidly increasing population, far surpassing that of France, or even America; yet it does not increase, it is stationary; the principle is just sufficiently strong to maintain the population in its present state. It is consequently not so strong as in America, for no other reason, that I am acquainted with, than that the nation at

large feel more of that anxiety which is consequent to the middle class of this nation. In order to increase the population of China, the rank of the common people must be elevated; this would enable them to provide more easily the means of subsistence, they have enough, but it is obtained with care. Continue the means of subsistence in the same measure, but remove the care, and the number of children, experience teaches, would increase.

It has been repeatedly observed that the principle of population was lessened in the two opposite states of civilization,---the highest, or the state of the greatest mental exertion; the lowest, or that state in which the baser and more depressing passions influence and direct the actions: in a word, by the savage and by the highly civilized states.

Were the government of a country, in the state in which Europe now is, to ameliorate the condition of the common people, the population would increase in proportion as the hinderances were removed which had suppressed it. On the other hand, were the condition of the common people rendered more uncomfortable, population would decrease; it decreases in Turkey, in Poland, and in Egypt: in these

countries there is enough, and to spare, of the means of subsistence, but the people are wretched ; they are not so far elevated as to enjoy the security and comfort of the European peasants ; Place them in that state, and no one can doubt that population would increase there as it does elsewhere.

There is a certain rank which is most friendly to population, all above or below this lessen the force of the principle of increase. To increase the population of a state, it is not enough to feed the inhabitants with a certain daily allowance, if that were the case, a prison or a brothel would be as friendly to procreation as a cottage ; something more is requisite.

When the population of a state stops, we are not to imagine that the number of violent deaths have overtaken the principle of increase. Population stops without an increase in deaths ; it has stopped in Spain and Portugal, but it goes on in France ; Mr. M. says that nation could furnish her armies with 150000 recruits annually, without diminishing the number of the existing families : from hence it may be argued, that the condition of the people in that country is improving ; but it does not imply that the Spaniards have not bread enough, they may

not want the means of subsistence, but they want better laws, laws that secure their happiness.---I apprehend the rate of the increase of the peasants of the farming districts of this country will never be greater than it is, but a further elevation of sentiment and of character would be borne without its being lessened ; they must become much wiser than the middle class, as it is now called, before they are as unproductive, because they have less care.

A government, that for a succession of years, pays the strictest attention to the improvement of the people, and as far as possible suppresses vice and banishes misery, would find that its population required not the sword to thin it. Like the Athenians, in the best days of their republic, or like the best informed classes of subjects in the modern states of Europe, more care would be requisite to guard against a decrease than to prevent the contrary.

Another general observation that I shall make, is, that a society divided into classes is in the best state for improvement. Suppose two thousand persons were to reside together, a certain proportion would be farmers, one would be a miller, a third a baker, and they all would be fully employed, and would be in circumstances

considerably more conducive to happiness than that of the mere shepherd; this is the simplest state of civilized society, but an addition to such a society would be difficult to make: suppose fifty were added, they could not employ another miller or baker, and the consequence must be, that they must live in a state not so much divided; each family must supply all its own wants, which would reduce them below the 2000 in civilization. Hence it would seem that there exists a reciprocal connection between civilization and population; the one cannot increase without the other, to a certain extent.

Again, suppose a nation to consist of many sets, if I may call them so, of 2000 each, their improvement would be extremely slow if they lived detached, because there would be a want of emulation. There is little emulation in a village, every one transacts his business with his neighbour. But in a large town society is more divided: besides the tradesmen, and others employed in procuring articles of the first necessity, there are individuals who are independent of any care or concern about business; this class, though not essential to the existence of a state, is highly instrumental to its welfare; it gives birth to new occupations, and

excites emulation; the patronage of the wealthy is worth an effort to procure, the effort gives birth to improvement, and civilization goes forward; and as it advances, the principle of increase is called into full exercise, without the smallest dread of the consequences. Population cannot advance too fast while knowledge is increasing; nor can it ever extend so far as to need the correction of vice, for the principle is lessened by the emulation consequent on a full population.

OF THE

# DOCTRINE OF PROVIDENCE.

A BELIEF in the existence of a supreme, intelligent First Cause is avowed by many, who discredit the general sentiment that a revelation of the mind and will of this Pure Intelligence has been made to man, and who imagine that they have attained the knowledge they possess concerning him by the light of their understandings; but in this I apprehend they have deceived themselves. The mind, fettered and debased by the organized body in which it acts, is, I apprehend, capable of comprehending and judging only of material objects; it cannot ascend beyond their sphere: it plans, contrives, and invents, but such efforts relate entirely to the connection of matter with matter.

The greatest discoveries to which man has ever presumed, (I allude to the arts and sciences in their application and use), are limited to the

wants of the body, and the inquisitiveness of the mind respecting the operation of fixed laws on inanimate substances. Names may be given to these laws, but, abstractedly considered, we know nothing of them: Who has any idea of gravity, distinct from matter? The arts and sciences cannot aid our researches when applied to discover the attributes and perfections of God; nor can we, by their aid, ascertain that God exists, or even advance one step in the enquiry. If we cannot by these means gain such knowledge, from what source is it to be obtained? Will abstract reasoning, or reasoning by analogy, direct us right? Certainly not. Independently of instruction, in other terms of revelation, experience is the guide of man; and what does experience avail us on this subject?

As a test of the strength of the human capacity, let us try what discoveries can be made by its own efforts. Suppose it to have been ascertained, that, of a certain genus of animals, say the wolf, one species was undescribed, who among naturalists could picture to himself the unknown animal, or even represent a form suited to that genus? Intimately acquainted with every branch of natural history and of

science in general, it might be expected that experience would direct at once to the discovery; but it is not thus: man has no power of discovery. If, in this instance, the attempt be made, it consists in uniting the several parts of animals already known, and thus forming a monster. Some naturalists speak of a chain in the works of nature, but not a single link has been supplied by the force of the mind of the philosopher, he waits till actual observation has identified the object. The fact appears to be, that man is capable of receiving instruction, and in this respect his mind is of vast capacity, but it cannot instruct itself---it cannot go without a guide---it is not independent. If its powers are unlimited, their exercise do not depend on itself; there is something implied in knowledge, besides a capacity to learn.

In further proof of the limited nature of the human capacity, we may observe, that if a person of the strongest intellectual powers were desirous of acquiring a knowledge of the nature and perfections of Deity, without the aid of revelation, his first object of course would be to form an idea of a person and character somewhat more than human, and then proceed to still more exalted beings; the attempt has been

made, but the result shows the absolute incapacity in man to instruct himself. The fairest and most perfect form ever represented, is that of man; and to make it more than human, wings are added: the idea is unscientific, if not ridiculous; a form like that of man's was never intended for flight, the centre of motion is in the back, which, wings applied to the shoulders, must destroy; besides, are the wings of birds suitable to such a purpose? If the organized being next to man has wings, the whole form is necessarily different from man's; but what that form is, has never been imagined.

If there are these difficulties in representing a body more excellent than our own, a mind of other faculties, other passions, and other appetites, is so incomprehensible, that we are obliged to use those common to man on all occasions. Even when speaking of God, we have no conception of other powers than those we are endowed with; all are human. If then the first step cannot be taken, how can the more remote and difficult? But the deist says, the mind of man is sufficiently capacious for all its wants, and that a knowledge of God may be gained from his works. From which of his works? From the planets: they exist, but who is acquainted

with their nature? The whole force of human ingenuity has long been directed to the discovery, and many remarks have been made, but observe their nature,---they are all borrowed from the globe we inhabit, as if matter could exist in no other state than as we see it. Mountains, volcanoes, islands, these are the supposed discoveries. Is this earth a model, after which every planet was formed? or is the mind of man such, that it is capable of enquiring only after such objects as experience has taught it a knowledge of? But suppose the planets were composed of materials similar to those of the earth, a discovery of their extent, their relation to each other, or their duration, would not advance our knowledge of the First Cause: if information of this description could do it, the study of our globe would be the most proper, because our acquaintance with it is more intimate than it possibly can be of any other planet. But the deist may say, it is not by studying the modifications of matter that he has gained the knowledge he possesses, but by observing the general order of the universe, the arrangement of its parts, the fitness, harmony, and perfection that is every where maintained; he defies a fortuitous concourse of atoms to have formed

the universe, or a blind chance to direct it; and is it certain he has gained his knowledge by thus reasoning? The universe, under this view of it, is made to convey the idea of a machine, and a machine implies a maker; every thing is argued from the arrangement that can be traced: but if we set our experience aside, our opinions would not be very conclusive from such evidence.

Suppose a watch had been cast on the shores of Otaheite, before that island was visited by Europeans, would the natives, after examining its parts, and seeing their fitness to each other, come to an unshaken belief, that, at some distant place there lived a watchmaker,---a man like themselves, but more expert and skilful: of the nature of the materials of which it was composed they would know nothing, of the principle on which it was kept in motion they would be equally ignorant, nor would they understand its mechanism; they might see that its parts corresponded, but that would not direct them to the maker. In place of ascribing it to the invention of man, it is more probable they would believe it to be the production of some animal in the ocean; but whether it was a whole or a part, whether it was endowed with life, or was

the nest of an animal, would be equally uncertain; they might be perplexed, but they would not be satisfied as to its origin. But the deist thinks he has obtained certain knowledge of the being of God; it is an article of his faith, which he thinks he can demonstrate. But if an uninformed person would not be able satisfactorily to prove the existence of a person superior in understanding to himself by examining a machine of his constructing, neither would man, however great his talents, discover his Maker by his works; his reasoning would confound, but not satisfy him. Were the construction and the use of a watch explained to an Otaheitean, he would credit the person if he declared himself the maker of it. And when it is made known that there is one God, the creator of heaven and earth, God is seen in every thing, and all the affairs of the universe that are under our observation direct and enforce the sentiment; but without this clue I apprehend an unshaken belief of this important truth could not have been held.---By saying there is a God, nothing is understood of his nature, his perfections, or his residence; and allowing the deist all he can pretend to, it amounts only to this, that the world, like a machine, was made by

design, but he is ignorant of him by whom it was made. In looking into his works they appear imperfect; he sees design, but he cannot see so much either of wisdom or benevolence as he himself possesses. He thinks he could improve the state of the world, and the condition of man; he would admit no sultry heats or piercing colds, poverty and pain he would also exclude, and in a thousand other instances improve the present course of things.

To think thus meanly of the Great Architect of nature, and I apprehend deists in general would think thus if they had only their own understandings to guide them, is to dishonour him; but by the utmost exercise of their understandings, and allowing all their pretensions, they cannot know him in any way worth knowing--the knowledge they can gain amounts to nothing, it is as bad as total ignorance---it can answer no beneficial purpose---it cannot teach man the relation he stands in to his Maker---it cannot teach him his immortality. Experience, as has before been said, is the guide of man; without it he would not even know that he should die; he sees it in others and infers it of himself, but his reason is not strong enough to teach the fact.---When knowledge has been some time acquired, the means

are forgotten; this may be the case with the deists. But suppose it granted that the deist can discover as much of the Deity by his works as may be discovered of a mechanic by investigating a machine of his constructing, what further advances have or can be made? The Jews were early made acquainted with the being and nature of God, and of his relation to his creatures; they knew more than any man could have discovered, and what they knew they taught. It was enough to excite curiosity, but not to satisfy it. The philosophers of Greece and Rome directed their attention to the subject; they anxiously desired to increase their information, but they did not advance a single step: on the other hand, they made that which was clear, dark; they could not comprehend, and did not believe, the unity of God; the immortality of the soul they thought doubtful, they wished it might be so. If their writings abound with sentiments we admire, in the records of the Jews we find the same more forcibly expressed.

The deist cannot complain that he has been taken by surprise, that he has not been allowed time to exercise his talents on the subject; he has certainly had ample time, and he has employed it in the best way he was able. All the

mind of man is capable of doing in making discoveries beyond the range of material objects has been done. When the outlines of revealed truth were made known to the Jews, or their predecessors, a pause ensued: time was given to man to exercise his talents; they were exercised; the whole world became deists. They believed what was declared, but they could learn no more; the utmost acuteness of philosophy could not add a single ray of light; and the whole world, with all the boasted powers of man, was compelled to wait for further information, until the mission of Jesus Christ.

If the knowledge of God be obtained without revelation, it is obtained without an effort of the understanding, for the rudest and most barbarous nations profess not only to believe in, but to worship, God. Reason certainly did not teach them this, for they are incapable of applying their reason to such a subject; they must have received what they know as an instinct, or by instruction; if by instruction, who taught them? This leads us to the origin of their nation, and is no small proof that the whole world was once one community, and that the knowledge communicated early in the history of man he carried with him whithersoever he went.

So that the deist has no room to boast of his understanding; what he knows, the most unlettered know; his superior intelligence has not advanced him above them in theology.

In the preceding remarks I have endeavoured to trace a belief in the being of a God up to revelation; and thus to prove, that the atheist is the only character that derives his faith from the light of nature: he believes his senses, and his reason is governed by them; he sees that the sun rules the day and the moon the night, and he is satisfied with secondary causes; beyond which, human reason, unaided by revelation, it is probable cannot go. But the deist of the present day believes much more than the atheist can possibly learn, and more than the wisest of the heathens knew: he has obtained confidence where Cicero doubted; and if he has acquired his information from any other source than the books of the Old and New Testament, he will do well to mention it.

My object in attempting to identify the Deity the deist acknowledges, with the God the christian worships, is, that I may interest both parties, in an attempt to vindicate his honour. The intelligent deists are many of them among Mr. Malthus's converts, but the

doctrines advanced, as the laws by which the principle of increase is directed, is unworthy the God we have been speaking of; they are not kind, neither are they wise. The God of the deists is good, but in what does it consist if vice and misery are the chief instruments of his power? God is an object of worship, but where is there a man who can lift up his mind in adoration of such a being? Who can obey or love him?

Connected with a belief in the being of a God, is that of his providence. As he formed the world, it must have been in wisdom; that he afterwards abandoned it to laws without intelligence is contrary to every event in life, and to every appearance in nature. What now would have been the state of the globe, had not wisdom directed and adapted its laws to its circumstances? Since its creation it has undergone many important changes. At that period, when the fountains of the deep were broken up,---when what is now dry land rose from the bottom of the sea,---when water covered the globe, and there are many existing proofs, as well as traditionary accounts, that this has actually happened,---when, I say, the laws by which the world was governed were thus dissolved, by what power

were they restored? By their own. This could not be,---for if they were not able to prevent the flood, it is impossible they should correct the evils of it. At such a period, and for such a purpose, intelligence and power, foreign from themselves, were as essentially necessary as at their beginning.

Subsequent to the creation an immense weight has been added to the poles: the arctic circles are inaccessible, from the immense bodies of ice with which they are loaded: had laws, undirected by Intelligence, been set over the world, they must have suffered some interruption from this cause, and the slightest interruption would be death to all its inhabitants; a little more tardiness in its evolutions, a little more heat, or a little more cold, and every living thing must perish. Besides, has the water which is thus locked up in ice had no effect? It is taken from one purpose and applied to another; Intelligence alone can do this, and not injure. The air we breathe is also liable to perpetual but irregular changes; myriads of animals breathe, decompose, and, as far as relates to respiration, destroy it now, which did not exist immediately after the flood: a considerable portion of what then encircled the globe is confined and consolidated:

many substances owe the chief part of their weight to air reduced to this state, Has there been a creation of air to supply its place, or has a substitute been found? Determine the question as we may, Intelligence must have directed it.

Man is adapted to the world just as it is, he cannot sustain any variation or interruption of its laws; but as this is always in danger of happening, care is requisite to prevent the evil, or repair its consequences. This care we call Providence,---in other words, the superintendance of God over the works of his hands.--- Of Providence Mr. Malthus seems to have a very vague and imperfect idea: he quotes a passage from Dr. Franklin, stating, that a single plant of fennel would bear seeds enough in a very few years to cover the whole earth with plants of that description. "This is incontrovertibly true," says Mr. Malthus, and he goes on to observe, that "through the animal and vegetable kingdoms nature has scattered the seeds of life abroad with the most profuse and liberal hand, but has been comparatively sparing in the room and the nourishment necessary to rear them. The germs of existence contained in this spot of earth, with ample food and ample

room to expand in, would fill millions of worlds in a few thousand years. Necessity, that imperious, all-pervading law of nature, restrains them within the prescribed bounds. The race of plants and the race of animals shrink under the great restrictive law, and the race of man cannot by any effort of reason escape from it."* It is not unusual with philosophers to lay aside their belief in christianity, and to reason independently of it; Mr. Malthus, though not a deist, has here furnished us with a specimen of such reasoning; he argues from the works of God, which deists say are sufficient to teach the knowledge of him, and what inference does he draw? This monstrous one---That the law of necessity corrects the errors in the constitution and government of the world. This is reasoning by the light of nature, and if it be a fair specimen of the light of reason on this subject, it is a conclusive one---that the human understanding cannot attain to a knowledge of God. The representation given, makes the Almighty much more unwise in planning, and weaker in executing, than man,---of course it does not represent God.

* Malthus's Essays, page 2.

Such is the view of Providence made known by philosophy; but let us attend a little more closely to the argument. Mr. Malthus is of opinion that there is an analogy in principle between the birth of children and the production of seeds; that, in fact, only one principle pervades the vegetable and animal kingdoms, but he is mistaken: the seeds of plants were not designed all to vegetate, it was not the purpose for which they were allowed to grow; they are the proper food of animals, the well adapted means of their subsistence; enough fall to the ground to continue the species and to renew the supply for animals, and these are all that it ever was designed should grow. The same idea will apply to animals, they were not designed merely to propagate their kind, but to subsist each other; their flesh is devoured. But mark the high honour put on man, he is not the means of subsistence to any creature;---none depend upon him; the end of his creation bears no analogy to that of plants and animals,---their ultimate end is the subsistence of man, and myriads receive existence on this account. But no sooner does the mind cease to animate the body than it is of no further use, and is carefully interred, or in some other way concealed

from the sight of man and the power of animals. The moralist might ask, Why then was man created? The answer would be, that as his usefulness cannot be discovered in time, we must look beyond it, and hence an argument is adduced in favour of his immortality.

The doctrine of Providence has never received that attention its importance demands, and if Mr. Malthus has not investigated the subject for himself, he may well have fallen into errors. Of the essays that have been written, declamation is too commonly substituted for argument; and the ideas afloat in the world are unsatisfactory and vague.

The Providence of God is a subject on which man may exercise his judgment; enough has been told him of it. It respects material objects, at least this is one branch of it; and it invites our attention. The Almighty has here placed himself before us; he governs the world, and by giving us the capacity has authorized the inquiry; we may judge of the equity, the wisdom, and the benevolence of his administration; it is a test to which we can put the truth of revelation; in it the laws are contained, before our eyes are their execution.

It would be inconsistent with my present

plan to enter largely into the subject, a few remarks are all I design. The government of God over this world principally respects its productions and inhabitants,---such as vegetables, animals, and man. The two former are little instrumental to their own welfare, they neither plan nor invent; a blind, unerring instinct guides the one, the other is without sensibility. If there be order, harmony, and design, in the relation of the parts of these two kingdoms, they are not the occasion of it; some power, independently of them, gives to each its proper station, its proper office, and its proper food: that power is God; he created them, and it would be folly to suppose their wants are supplied by another. In the provision he has made for this part of creation we can best judge of the nature of his government, because it is not opposed. Animals and vegetables are as entirely dependent as if they had not life; they are more so than the members of a family, or the subjects of a government, are to their respective heads. And how does he govern them? Has he created a want without providing the means of its full satisfaction, or a desire which is not gratified? There is much seeming irregularity and unrestrained

waste of life, but still perfect order reigns; no one species becomes too numerous or too few for the post assigned it.

As animals live not solely for their own gratification and pleasure, but as the means of subsistence to man, this end of their creation must be answered, which subjects them to individual evil; and there may be other causes of their suffering, which I shall not here touch on. But which of them, while they range the forest, can have any thing added to their happiness? and after they are domesticated, what do they want? The sum of their happiness is assuredly great, and the care of their Sovereign and Benefactor is incessant and minute. Is the winter cold and the summer hot, their covering is adapted to each season; is a regular supply of food necessary, it is spread before them. In the summer the earth is covered with verdure, in the winter the trees and shrubs are hung with seeds of various descriptions for their use. For some animals, indeed, no provision is made, or it is made in a distant country; in that case the animal is either rendered insensible to want, or directed to the supply.

In the vegetable kingdom the same care, the same directing hand, is manifest. They take

no thought, yet there is wisdom in the order they observe, and it is nicely adapted to the wants of animals; their growth and maturity betoken as much design as is manifest where the skill of the gardener is exerted; in the management of a garden we are acquainted with the design, and admire it in proportion as it is apparent. But mere animals take no care, yet they have a succession of food, adapted to the season and abundant in quantity. The hardy plants sprout and grow while winter yet reigns, others stretch in full vigour far through the autumn; and one large class, the mosses, flourish only in the coldest season of the year. If to this be added the effects of frost in rendering sweet and palatable the strong luxuriant grass of summer, the want of animals are amply provided for.---But it may be said, the growth of vegetables is according to the fixed laws of nature, and they require no other superintendance; should that be granted, no fixed law can adjust the proportions, season after season: it is by a law of nature that vegetables grow in the spring, but there is no law of nature to prevent animals from destroying the plant before the seed is matured, and preventing a succession of crops. There is no law of nature to prevent animals from becoming too

numerous; and, left to themselves, they would become so; but a check, just sufficiently strong, is always applied.

It is the opinion of eminent naturalists, that the sheep is so defenceless an animal, that, unless it lived under the protection of man, the race would soon be extinct. The same might be said of other animals; but they are protected by him who assigned them a useful and a permanent place in the creation, who shields them from such enemies as would destroy them. The same fact applies to many plants cultivated in our gardens; they are guarded or they would be devoured, and a succession prevented: they require care more than that which the laws of nature imply, and it always has been given to them: they existed before we manured their roots or watered their blades.---Dr. Darwin, and other distinguished philosophers, were so fully satisfied that there was design in the economy of plants beyond that of their growth in the spring and decay in the autumn, that they imagined plants themselves were sentient, and indeed rational beings; and in endeavouring to support this opinion, many curious facts have been brought forward: they fall far short of proving what was designed, but, urged in evi-

dence of a superintending Providence, are conclusive and satisfactory. Dr. Darwin saw, in their wonderful economy, so much that was above the reach of chance or accident, that he did not hesitate in ascribing it to the directing power of reason: and it is unnecessary to say, whatever opinion the ingenious Doctor might hold on the subject, that the faculty was not in the plants.

Taking it then for granted, that reason is exerted in their economy, all that we have to prove, is, that reason is continually exerted, and that fixed laws, such as move the planets in their spheres, are not applicable to them: there is not enough of uniformity to admit the idea of their being governed by power without wisdom; and power is all that is implied when a fixed law is spoken of. If a continued exercise of the understanding is necessary in the management of a garden, it is more so in preserving every part of the vegetable kingdom from destruction, and in providing a due supply for the wants of animals.

When we speak of the laws of nature, we connect with them an idea of their being almost self-existent and independent, but they certainly are not so: they had a beginning, and are liable to change; they are the instruments of

the pleasure of another and superior power. Summer and winter succeed each other uniformly, and the law seems fixed respecting them; the sun is always in a certain sign in a given month; uniformity in the order of things seems thus far necessary, because the sun's influence is directed to more planets than our own: but it is not the position of the sun in the zodiac that constitutes our summer,--it is always of a given height at a given time, but it has not always a given influence: something more is implied in the return of summer besides the direction we are in to the sun. No two seasons resemble each other---it is not equally hot in the corresponding days of different years, the summer advances one year a month earlier than it does another, but our relation to the sun is the same. No two winters are alike in the quantity of rain, of wind, or in temperature. There is no uniformity in the laws that respect this earth, unless they respect others also. When, therefore, we speak of fixed laws, we should bear in mind their application; and we shall find, however certain they may be, they are not self-directing. The earth performs its evolutions with precise regularity, because such regularity may be necessary to other planets; the laws of attraction and

repulsion are uniform, they are fixed laws, and are as well calculated to produce a correspondence in the seasons as they are in the evolutions of the globe. Why then is it not equally warm on the first of May in two succeeding years, but that the fixed laws, as they are called, are subordinate to other influence? Laws that act by a continuation of the first impulse given, are invariable; like the motion of a machine, or like that of the planets: but as no such regularity is apparent in directing the particular affairs of this globe, they must either be left to accident, or appointed and managed by direct and immediate power.

A motion as uniform as that of the earth may be conducted by intelligence, or it may be the effect of laws without intelligence; but an occasional, irregular, and uncertain action, answering some determined purpose, must be ruled and managed by direct interference. The vegetable kingdom is principally influenced by the state of the atmosphere: heat and cold, moisture and drought, affect the life of plants; a change of seasons is of no comparative consequence to man; he is, through the whole year, and in every climate, the same; if the air is salubrious it is all that concerns him: but

the growth and life of vegetables depend on the weather. We ought therefore to consider it as that part of the Providence of God which relates principally to them, and the object of our consideration is, whether it is adapted to that purpose, whether its uncertainty and variability are the creatures of accident or of design: if of design, they have not the uniformity consequent on laws that are not guided by intelligence.

Were writers on the subject of Providence to confine their attention to the inanimate and irrational parts of creation, it would not be more difficult to prove that an unseen hand guides, controuls, and directs their affairs, than it is to prove that a city was built by men for purposes connected with human wants. In place of this, the principle is generalized, and the human race is made the principal object of study. Every department of nature should be considered apart, and its government apart. By referring every thing immediately to ourselves, we create disorder where there is the greatest fitness. We suffer no injury by changes in the atmosphere that are beneficial to plants, but if we apply those changes to ourselves, we are ready to ask, Why are they suffered, we are not benefited?

Bearing this idea in mind we shall proceed to a consideration of the Providence of God, as exercised over man. Man is as dependent on his Maker's pleasure as the brute, but his dependence is not precisely of the same nature. The wants of the brute are supplied without their care, they live on what is provided for them; but it has pleased God to enjoin conditions on man, as the terms of his existence. He is naked and must clothe himself, he is without shelter and must build himself a habitation, he is without a due supply of subsistence and must exert himself to increase his stock. If these terms are not complied with, the blessings are not possessed; the earth does not yield her increase, and the body sickens for want of defence. Our own concurrence and aid are essential to our comfortable support; it is a mark of dignity to be entrusted with power. We are here elevated above the brute, our obligations to our Creator and to ourselves are not theirs; we may abuse our power, or neglect its requirements, they cannot. Seed only is put into our hands, which we must cultivate, that we may have a crop; they live on that which their care never nurtured.

Besides these obligations there is another,

still more important and dignifying, under which we live. Man is a social being, and morality is essential to his existence in that state: morality is the basis of human laws, the price and pledge of human existence---Who would sow, if he were not secure of reaping? To destroy that security is a breach of morality; it is a violation of a natural law. The most barbarous nations respect life and property, and the obligation is enforced by civil penalties. A state moralizes as it refines, and calls more of this natural law into exercise. In other terms, morality and refinement are to a certain extent synonymous. The morality of an Otaheitean is not so complete as that of a Swiss, yet the principle is the same. The Otaheitean knows only a few of its simplest maxims, such as are just sufficient to keep their society in existence; the Swiss, being further advanced in civilization, know more of the reciprocal obligations due from one person to another. Such knowledge is civilization. We do not speak of a nation as civilized because the arts of war are well understood, but because the arts of peace are practised; because the moral obligations are known and enforced. Morality, though a law of nature, is not an instinct; we discover it by our

reason. Reason, when least assisted by experience, enjoins it, and well-informed men have urged the most cogent arguments in its support. it is a subject which always claims attention, and it is fully within our capacity. It may be said, that it does not relate to matter; but it relates to man as a resident on this globe, and respects his present good. We know nothing of morality, and it can have no existence apart from matter: it is a human law, a law limited in its obligation to this globe: were any particular act specified, it would be found to have a relation to property, to the rights and privileges of another.---Many attempts have been made to improve the moral condition of particular nations, which have failed from wrong ideas of morality---for that is not moral which is not useful: it is not moral to offer human sacrifices, yet every nation in the world has done it; but the error has been seen, and the practice abolished as soon as the right of man to life has been understood. Morality is uniformly the same, but a knowledge of its precepts are only attainable by an acquaintance with the respective rights of others. It is not easy to conceive of an individual, cast on a desert island, being immoral; he cannot commit an offence

against man; if he injures himself, if he puts a period to his existence, it is to God alone that he has to account, and the crime is of a deeper dye than what is commonly implied by the term morality. Morality is highly honourable in the estimation of mankind; the more the rights of others are respected, the more their good opinion is gained. The mission of Jesus Christ was not necessary to teach the world morality, because its purest precepts are of the highest utility, and the same capacity that can appreciate their worth, could have discovered them. Morality is distinct from religion; it is rewarded in this world, religion is not. Morality is enforced by religion, but loses much of its general respect among men when practised from that avowed motive.

There is still another interesting light in which man must be viewed before a just idea can be formed of the providential government of God respecting him. He is free, at least to a limited extent; the conditions of his easy and pleasant passage through life he is not compelled to perform: he may allow the ground to lie waste---he is not constrained to weave garments or build houses---in our conduct we deliberate and judge, and from our judgment act; virtue

and vice pass in review, and we choose which we will: but here man's influence and power over himself cease---he cannot prevent the consequences of his conduct; he may choose to take no food, but he cannot choose whether he will feel the want of it or not,---he may choose to be in health, but that is not always at his option,---he may choose to be tall in stature, but that is not at his command,---or rich, this also is denied him,---he may shorten, but cannot lengthen his life,---he cannot determine in what age he will be born, of what parents, or under what circumstances,---he cannot appoint the leading events of his life, he acts from circumstances over which he has no controul.

The liberty of man respects his moral actions, and the fulfilment of certain conditions, on which the means of his subsistence depend; the abuse of this liberty is connected with the evil that abounds in the world. God is evidently not chargeable with it, it does not form part of his government.---I cannot here help expressing an idea, that there is something wrong in man besides his morals, but this I leave.

When we speak of the Doctrine of Providence, we ought to divest ourselves of the consideration of those subjects over which the

conduct of man extends its influence; we must divest ourselves of all considerations of his moral conduct: nor are we to consider the doctrine with regard to the irregular and scanty supply of the means of man's subsistence, or of his garments or habitation, these are put into his hands to manage; he is furnished with the materials, the execution is his own: all he is promised is, a blessing on his own endeavours; it is the *hand of the diligent that maketh rich.* The Providence of God is directed by an influence of a different nature, an influence wholly independent of the voluntary actions of man. The Jews were a perverse people, and they suffered the consequences of their crimes, but still the events to be accomplished by them were accomplished: their conduct reflected disgrace, and brought punishment upon themselves, but yet the course of events went on; one taking place after another, with as much precision as if they had been a most obedient people. The great God asks not the consent nor the aid of man to execute his pleasure; man reaps the reward of his own doings, but he cannot frustrate the designs of heaven; the liberty that is granted him extends in its influence over this world, one is injured by the misconduct of

another. A thief commits an offence against the laws of nature and the light of reason, and many are injured either directly or in a more indirect manner; it is the highest folly so to act. Immorality, in all of its forms, is too weak and foolish for man to commit, and could not be practised were there not something wrong in his disposition; his judgment condemns his actions, but still he perseveres.

In the view I take of the subject, the design of God in Providence has for its object the exaltation of the character of the human race; and Revelation points this out as the end of his dispensations. It is promised to man that he shall live in the exercise of the spirit of christianity, and Providence is engaged in the execution of the promise. It is not in the supply of our bodily wants that the wisdom of God is chiefly displayed; the grass of the field and the fowls of the air display more of it than we do, but we are to look to the plan that is laid for improving the nature of man. Revelation marks the steps, Providence secures their accomplishment. Events, perfectly consistent with the freedom of man, are brought about in such order, and so exactly as predicted, that it is evident the actors were guided through

them by some influence unknown to themselves. It would be to me a very agreeable employment to examine the truth of these ideas by the sacred Scriptures, from whence they are borrowed, but it would extend the chapter too far, and in some measure interfere with my plan, which is only to give a philosophical view of the subject.

Before we proceed any further, let us endeavour to obviate an objection. No part of Revealed Truth is more commonly jeered at than the doctrine of Providence. A person who has come unhurt from a battle, thanks God for his providential care; another, with a smile of derision, asks if it was by the providence of God that othets were shot? One who has acquired a fortune expresses his gratitude and attributes his prosperity to Providence; but what does he say who has lost a fortune, perhaps in consequence of the other's gaining one? Difficulties of this nature are removed by considering that a portion of liberty is given, and that God never averts from man the consequences of his conduct; such events arise from human actions, and do not come under the idea we attach to Providence.

War is not an institution of God, and who-

ever engages in it must share of its evils. If a person escapes unhurt it is well, but it does not imply any extraordinary interposition of Providence to effect it. A person gains a fortune, he is not a favourite of heaven on that account: honour is not put on wealth by the Sovereign of nature.

God has spread a table, and has invited the whole world to partake; enough is provided for all, but the terms he has enjoined are better performed by some than others; hence inequality arises in the distribution. Were all to exert themselves, as it is their duty to do, all would receive an abundance; the inequality is occasioned by a defect in human institutions and in human conduct, not in the Providence of God.---I do not mean to insinuate that a difference in rank is not desirable; the idea I wish to convey is, that poverty and wretchedness need not be endured.

But, to return to the subject, the Providence of God respects man as a rational being, and not as a mere animal, much of what relates to him in this last capacity being entrusted to himself, as already mentioned. The predictions that have been made, all refer to the improvement of man's intellectual character; temporal

evil attends the progress, but temporal good is not the reward. No prophecy has been fulfilled by the will or the power of man, statesmen have never made one of them the subject of their deliberations, nor have they in any way designedly assisted in their accomplishment. The human race have possessed and abused their portion of liberty, while the purposes of God have been and are accomplishing. But it may be said, that war, and a variety of evils, are predicted to precede and accompany the fulfilment of a great part of the prophecies:--- To foretel an event is not to appoint it. The liberty of man will never be violated; and so long as the majority of mankind are as we now see them, evils will abound. The wars that commonly happen are only the personal quarrels of two or more men, who, having power, use it, calamity follows calamity; and as they began war of their own pleasure, of their own pleasure terminate it: God has not interfered, he has never engaged to interfere; his engagement with man is to lead him forward towards happiness, and this is not the means of its fulfilment. But some wars are interesting in their consequences, and evidently referred to in prophecy. The evil of war is not necessarily connected with the

good designed; the end of the dispensations of God is the happiness of man, the evil that attends them arise from hinderances which are interposed by man, and they are foretold as an evidence of the truth of what is written, and not as the pleasure of our Maker concerning us.

When a disposition or sentiment prevails among a people, of which the government does not partake or approve, to divert the public attention laws are made, and probably a foreign war engaged in; should these not succeed, civil war follows, and the sceptre is sometimes broken by the strength of the people, as was the case in France. It is, I believe, the uniform opinion of christians, that the events which have taken place in that country were foretold. In the accomplishment a change took place in the sentiments of the people respecting the catholic religion; they saw it was better calculated to give power to the priests than honour to God; a jealousy arose between the government and the people, which ended in war. Had the government anticipated the changes of the people's sentiments, and increased their religious and civil liberties, the prophecy would have been accomplished, the tenth part of the city

would have fallen, and the world been benefited; but it was opposed, and a dreadful carnage ensued, and affairs of a religious nature now stand as they probably would have done had the government acted with the people. Liberty of conscience is granted, encroachments are made on the power of Rome, and will continue to be made till it ceases to be. The further progress may be opposed, and many more may fall, but the authority must be destroyed. It is easy to distinguish the good to be derived from the evil that attends it; they are evidently not connected; the good does not arise out of the evil, but the evil is vainly interposed to prevent the good.

That it is the design of Providence still to elevate, expand, and chasten the mind of man, cannot be doubted; what has been done has been gradual, and only in a particular line. Many of the ancients were better sculptors, better architects, better poets, more successful philosophers, and were perhaps better orators, than any of the present age, but they could not comprehend so much of those truths that dignify man. The Jews did not comprehend much of what was clearly expressed, but they comprehended more than the wisest Greeks.

The apostles of Jesus Christ did not understand the nature of his government, though he had often explained it to them. The wisest and best of men of the present day do not comprehend many things that are revealed, and which will one day be understood; but the generality of christians believe more, than the Jews, from the same testimony, could form any idea of; and those of the latter period of their history were better informed than those of the earlier.

It is in the gradual unfolding, the expanding of the human intellect in this direction, that I apprehend the directing hand of God is most evident; in it is seen the grand purpose of man's existence. We are witnesses to the increase of strength, the accession of intellect, in a youth; we are certain a child cannot learn, whoever may be his preceptor, things that are easily acquired by the adult: I apprehend it is the same in the mind of man; his ability to comprehend his Maker at first was weak, but as ages have rolled round, an accession has been made to the capacity.

On this view of the subject many difficulties are removed; it teaches us that we are not to expect so much from the ancients as from ourselves.

Revolving in my mind the arguments that

might be urged against the christian religion, no one has struck me so forcibly, as, that the morality inculcated in the New Testament is not the same as that allowed of in the Old, that is, adultery in the one, which was permitted in the other; but this objection is done away by considering the inferior state of human intellect at that time; that which was right and fit in itself the Jews had not a capacity to discern, they did not even understand the law of nature on the subject. A being a little above man, or man in that improved state which is promised him, will doubtless view many of the customs of the wisest and best of men of the present day as extremely mean and degrading, in the same manner as we do those of the Jews.

Let me illustrate my meaning of the human intellect being improved by another example. The Jews, who are now scattered into every nation of the world, expect, on the authority of Revelation, to return to their own land; were they to attempt to go immediately they would be foiled, obstacles insurmountable present themselves, and will continue to present themselves; and unless the dispositions both of the Jews and others change, their return, which will always be inimical to the interests of the nations

in which they now reside and those through which they must pass, cannot be effected; some opposition will be made, and where is the strength that must assist them? A general sentiment will prevail in their favour, and the opposition will not be well directed. We are, therefore, only to expect the return of the Jews, when their minds, and the minds of others, shall be suited to the event.

The manner in which God acts on the mind we do not know, it is said to be by the use of means, by instruction,---but that is not enough; it is a great mind that can comprehend great truths; the person that understands the writings of Newton, is but little inferior to him: and when a nation acquires an elevation of sentiment, without an improvement in the means of knowledge, I conclude their capacities have received an accession of strength, just the same as I conclude of a boy who has made progress at school. Voltaire exerted his talents to remove the superstition and destroy the power of the Romish church, and he is said to have succeeded, but were not the minds of the people disposed to receive the ideas he advanced before he published them? Fifty years before he wrote, such sentiments would have been received with indigna-

tion; they would have been considered as little short of blasphemy, and the author have been put to death: but when he wrote, his writings were received, the people were in a different state of mind to what they had been for a thousand years preceding.

The actions of men are not the rule, or even the means of God's conduct; he maintains his honour, he carries on his purposes independently of us, but yet in perfect consistency with the liberty he has granted.---The Jews were several times conquered and carried from their country as prisoners of war, was not this by the appointment of God and by the use of means? The Jews became immoral and idolatrous, and this was the mode of their punishment, but it was not the means of their improvement: they did not understand more of the nature of their religion by these evils: they learned his power to punish whose laws they had broken; but, had they not been idolatrous, they would have experienced his power to bless. Their being idolatrous was not by his appointment or approbation, of course cannot be said to be part of his government. Their guilt and punishment were cause and effect; but the promulgating of truth, and a capacity to understand it, are not cause

and effect. The wars of the Jews with the surrounding nations were not because these nations would not embrace their religion, nor is any temporal evil inflicted now because the christian faith is not received, its converts have never been made by force; it is not by means of scourges that truth is propagated, nor is it for doing that which is morally right that personal evil ensues.---The Scriptures trace the origin of war and the other evils that are in the world up to their true source, and they are expressly charged upon ourselves. It is a mistaken notion, that, because men are not religious therefore they cannot be moral. It is in the power of a government to do much for the morals of a country, and the reward of morality is temporal good; but too much is aimed at, and the whole miscarries.

The design of God in his government of the Jews was the birth of the Messiah; that great event happened in its due time; had they been moral it would not have happened sooner, nor did their immoralities retard it; but the morality in their power would have ensured their personal comfort.

Not only is the mental improvement I speak of distinct from morality, but it is distinct from

advances in other knowledge. An individual receives a talent for the investigation of one subject in which another has no pleasure; one is a botanist, another is an astronomer, a third prefers a different line of study, and the talents they are endowed with appear large enough to comprehend these several subjects; were their capacities enlarged, we do not know that the subjects would be equal to them. We do not perceive a want of intellect in the discussion of philosophical truths.---The ancients evidently possessed as acute and comprehensive talents as are now enjoyed, and had more advantages; they invented what we can scarcely improve: hence we may argue that it does not appear to have been the design of Providence to increase our capacities in the attainment of the knowledge of natural objects; the world at large is indeed shamefully ignorant, owing to the little care that has been taken to prevent it; but the wisest men of one age do not outstrip those of a former, nor are we, as it respects these subjects, to anticipate an improvement in the human intellect. The improvement spoken of is of another and a nobler kind,---it is a capacity to know more of God: in this direction the scale is ascending, the meanest persons of our day and

country know more than Socrates could learn; there is a prodigious difference between the rational knowledge we possess on this subject and that which was formerly possessed, but we do not know the period when men were inferior to each other in the rudiments of philosophical truths.

It is a common observation, that all governments have the seeds of dissolution in them: I would rather say the whole world is in motion, pressing forward, and that laws must be changed because man changes; those that are made may be well adapted to answer the purpose it was intended they should, the seed of dissolution may not be in them but in that change, in those they were intended to rule, which human skill and sagacity cannot prevent. The New Testament speaks of the downfal of antichrist; it is no code of laws, it is no line of conduct, however moral, that can prevent it. The laws made to protect the corruptions of christianity are as well fitted to the purpose as can be devised, and the whole civil power of Europe has enforced them, but the edifice already totters, and must fall; all that is human in it must give way to the progress of knowledge. Why it has pleased God to allow his religion to be corrupted,---

why he gave man any portion of liberty, knowing, as he did, that it would be abused,---why he has allowed of vice and misery in his creation, are questions he has not condescended to solve, and we have not the power to do it. We are here in a probationary state, and it becomes us to be satisfied, and to improve the talents we possess of every kind to their utmost extent, for it is only in such a way that we properly answer the end of our creation: it does not rest on the will or power of any man to fulfil a prophecy, we are not required to give ourselves any concern respecting them, their fulfilment do not depend on an ostensible actor, all that are concerned are prepared for the event, and it will be accomplished: but it becomes us so to act as those who are desirous that the will of God should be done on earth.

Many of the preceding remarks are applicable to the inhabitants of the world in every period of time; but the christian religion engages for its disciples a new relationship, and a more peculiar care; it explains, particularizes, and enforces the moral duties, they are essential to its privileges, but the merit and even the temporal advantages attendant on their performance are abolished. Morality is essential to the prac-

tice of the christian religion, but it is not christianity; it is not an effect of the same influence, it does not produce the same consequences. The disciples of Christ have no promise held out to them calculated to attach their affections to the world; no temporal good for moral worth; they are not promised honour in return for piety, they are not promised wealth as the reward of obedience; but they are assured of the hatred of the world: why this hatred should be manifested I am not now to enquire, but it has been and is their portion: however, they are promised and do enjoy happiness, of which those who despise them are ignorant: they have ascended a step higher in the creation, and have lost their relish of temporal things: whilst they are prompt in the discharge of their duties as members of society, they consider themselves as born for a higher destiny, which is ever kept in view. To such characters as these the world is made subservient; by their improvement in knowledge thrones and empires fall; they use not the sword, for the sword can only destroy, but they wait patiently the appointed time, and their Master makes their path plain to them.

I have dwelt thus long on the subject of this chapter, because I conceive it to be inti-

mately connected with it. It was necessary to state, as far as could be done philosophically, the origin of the evils that have long acted as scourges to mankind: if they are instituted, appointed, or even directed by God, Mr. Malthus has some ground on which to rest his arguments; but if man is FREE in his moral conduct, he is accountable for the consequences.

# CONCLUSION.

IN the foregoing remarks I have endeavoured to prove that the checks to population, which Mr. Malthus thinks have been as constant as any of the laws of nature, are not necessary to the government of the world; that they arise out of circumstances that are perfectly optional, and are most experienced under a bad system of government, and least under a good one, and consequently may in a great measure be driven from the world. Were war, famine, and pestilence, natural evils, provision would be made in the economy of nature to excite them, and their approach might be foreseen and calculated like the return of the seasons; a certain number of victims would fall in a given space of time, and no more; they would be to a nation what superabundant fruit is to a tree: but we are well assured that these evils may desolate

a land; we know of no check to their fury but human means, means that would have prevented their approach. Misery has ever been the consequence and the scourge of ignorance and depravity, knowledge its corrective; virtue and knowledge repair the breach made by vice and misery, but vice and misery cannot be applied to improve the effects produced by virtue and knowledge: hence, therefore, if virtue and knowledge are applicable to man, vice and misery can have no natural place in our economy. Very few persons have such an opinion of the Deity as to suppose that he would endow with life without providing the means of its support, yet this is the idea Mr. Malthus holds out: I need not say such an idea banishes the Deity from the world,---it cannot be, that the works of God are so imperfect, or his government so weak,---he has made laws which cannot be fulfilled, he has given promises he cannot verify. Morality ceases to have a name under such a government as Mr. M. describes: but, happily for mankind, vice and misery exist not as the sovereigns to which we are legitimately subject; they are the consequence of our ignorance, and can never be appealed to as friends. We can never say we want more vice and misery to ren-

der our condition better, but, on Mr. Malthus's theory, this is a very common want. Vice and misery are punishments, and punishment implies transgression; there is no authority in them; they sanction laws, but they are not laws themselves.

In the view I take of the subject, the life of man is secure, his happiness well guarded by obeying the laws Mr. Malthus would teach us to break. A wise and benevolent Creator has his eyes constantly upon us: has he appointed our years to be threescore and ten, they were intended for the business of life, and ought to be filled up in the service of mankind; not to be wasted in ennui, not to be dragged on thro' their latter half in perpetual fear of death, paralizing every action, and casting a gloom over scenes that ought to inspire joy. The business of life should go promptly on to its close; it is cowardice to shrink back when we have proceeded only half way, and seem afraid to meet fresh duties; it is our business to be always employed, that when the finger of death shall point towards us, we may have no duty unperformed. A hireling has his stated employment for the day, he may feel weary in the execution, but until he has fulfilled his obligation a respite from labour

is a crime. Infancy and youth are spent in acquiring knowledge, which experience matures: as knowledge is never lost, so it ought never to be unemployed; the bulk of mankind want instruction, and it ought to be the pleasure as it is the duty of those whose life is not necessarily occupied in their own affairs, to furnish them with the means. Life is a gift, the value of which is not generally appreciated; the accumulation of property, which ought to be only a secondary consideration, is made the first, and greatly tends to divide life between care and disgust; hence arise many evils which Mr. M. charges on Providence. But it may be said, should the mind be cultivated, it would be equivalent to passing a sentence of extinction on a family, and would prove an evil rather than a good.

It will be seen by the preceding chapters, that many circumstances and events of life have an influence on the propagation of the species. If a sober, steady, persevering effort to cultivate the understanding has an influence on the body, that influence is only in excess, it only threatens extinction, when it is connected with much anxiety and care: a cultivated mind is commonly eager to obtain distinction; schemes are

laid which, in attempting to execute, the mind is agitated in a thousand ways; and if under these circumstances children are born, they partake in some measure of the constitution of the children of mamelukes, and in a few generations, pursuing the same measures, extinction may be with certainty anticipated.---But where civilization and knowledge extend to the people at large, the same inordinate application, the same restless desire of fame cannot be felt, nor the same consequences follow. Athens is not an example to the contrary, the number of her free men were small, and they were to the world at large what the nobles of this country are to us.

But it may be asked, if a country was just as much civilized as to give to the principle of increase its full liberty, would not the people in a few years become too numerous? To this I answer, that the experiment has been tried: China has for ages been sufficiently civilized to ensure the people personal security; their numbers have not been wasted in war, or cut off by famine or pestilence, or lessened by celibacy, yet they ceased to increase. War, famine, and pestilence have not been more destructive since the population stopped, but care has been mul-

tiplied; the jarring interests of individuals are more felt; more personal exertion is requisite in a stationary than in an increasing population: the struggle, in any full-peopled state, is not so much for the bare necessaries of life as for its comforts, its riches, and its honours. Thousands of bushels of corn are yearly consumed in the Chinese distilleries, there is, of course, a surplus of food, which, on Mr. M's. theory, is a bait held out to population: here, however, is a refutation of his theory; China wants not bread, yet the births and deaths are equal: and what has occurred in one country, it is not difficult to prove may occur elsewhere.

Moral depravity every where exists, but it is not a severe check to the increase of population, except when it excites war. As the human intellect strengthens, and moral depravity becomes less, fewer children will be born: or should moral depravity remain as it does, an increase in civilization, or the care and anxiety consequent on a stationary population, however thin, is a sufficient guard against a too abundant increase.

But I cannot give up the idea that the period is hastening when the condition of mankind will be in a far better state than it now is, and that the world will not furnish arguments which may

excite in the mind of the most sceptical a doubt of the wisdom of the Author of it. Already I fancy I have seen the first dawning of this wished-for morning; already some slight coruscations have darted across the globe; the human intellect is every where maturing; institutions unfriendly to man are ready to fall by the force of reason. Where is there a country, our own and America excepted, in which the people are not wiser than the government? When this is the case a change is at hand. Was an alteration to take place in the government of Turkey, of Spain, of Morocco, would it be for the worse; and is a change not likely to happen?

FINIS.

*Northall and Dawson, Printers,*
Stockport.